

F. S. DYRNES
MAY 1935-R
R 2
QUARRYVILLE PA

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO., Inc.
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

JUNE, 1935

Vol. 6

No. 1

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Entered as second-class matter May 11,
1931, at the Post Office at Philadelphia,
Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Notes and Comments

THE POWER TO REPEAL

HT HAS recently been widely hinted that even should the 147th General Assembly desire to rescind the action taken by the last Assembly against the Independent Board, it would be powerless to do so, because "one Assembly may not review the actions of another." Apart from the manifest absurdity of such a statement—since, for example, every change in the operating system of the Boards of the church involves a change in the enactments of some previous Assembly—it is rather surprising to see those who have been talking hardest about the power of the General Assembly begin to tell us that the next Assembly must be bound by the unwise act of a predecessor. An interesting comment upon this question, and one that we believe states the law fairly, is found in the report of the Special Commission of 1925, reported to the Assembly of 1926 and adopted by that Assembly. The Commission said, on page 82: "There will be no question, perhaps, regarding the legislative and administrative acts of the General Assembly. Everyone recognizes the scope and effect of these powers when exercised. It is necessary to remember, however, that deliverances of the General Assembly, when it is sitting either in its legislative or administrative capacity, should be clearly distinguished from decisions in judicial cases when the Assembly exercises the powers of a judicial court; and these in turn are not to be confounded with the ordainment of organic law by the processes provided in the Constitution and referred to above. *When the General Assembly as a non-judicial body makes deliverances, they are entitled to great respect and deference, but they are subject to modification or repeal at any time by a majority vote of the General Assembly.*" (Italics ours.)

A SIGNIFICANT TESTIMONY

WE HAVE been pleased to learn that a nationwide committee of Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is in process of addressing a communication to their some 50,000 fellow-elders, insofar as their addresses are obtainable, asking them to subscribe to a "Testimony" bearing upon certain trends and conditions in the church of which in the providence of God they have been made rulers—trends and conditions which this committee views with grave concern because convinced that they are "impairing the witness of our church and its purity, peace and unity." This "Testimony" which has been prepared by a group of Ruling Elders—without advice of clergy, we believe—seems to us to be possessed of such interest and significance for the church at large that we are

taking the liberty of printing it in full on other pages of this paper.

It is worthy of note that while this "Testimony" is critical of the action of the last General Assembly relative to the Independent Board, it contains no endorsement, direct or indirect, of the Independent Board itself. The "Covering Letter" explicitly states that no member of the committee under whose authority the "Testimony" is being sent out is a member of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. How critical it is of the action of the last Assembly is indicated by the fact that it states as its reasoned conviction that said action is "opposed to the Word of God and the Constitution of our Church and . . . therefore null and void." Obviously, this throws the weight of its influence on the side of those who hold that the action of the last Assembly was unwise and unconstitutional—and that irrespective of what may be thought of the wisdom or constitutionality of the Independent Board itself. Its publication affords an added reason for thinking that the proposal to "reverse" or "rescind" the action of the last Assembly relative to the Independent Board will be one of the major issues before the approaching Assembly at Cincinnati.

It is heartening to note that these Ruling Elders are awake to the fact that "doctrinal differences lie at the heart of and furnish the motivating cause for the present discord in our church." This conviction finds fuller though hardly more explicit expression in the "Covering Letter" than in the "Testimony" itself. In the "Covering Letter" we read as follows:

"Despite protestations that there is no longer any doctrinal issue in our church, we are satisfied that there never was a time when doctrinal differences were more acute or threatening, or a time when, with such tremendous consequences to it and to the world, the church must choose definitely between evangelical belief and unbelief called for want of a better term, Modernism.

"We believe that orthodox historical Presbyterian belief and 'Modernism' are wholly irreconcilable and mutually destructive. Both groups exist in our church, as in other communions. One group will of necessity be either silenced or eliminated from our church ultimately. Which group do you want it to be?

"We believe the difference between these two groups in their essence, manifestation and logical conclusions, is the difference between:

1. The great verities of the Scriptures as interpreted in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms and construed by the General Assemblies of 1910, 1916 and 1923 over against the denials expressed in the so-called Auburn Affirmation;
2. Biblical missionary objectives and motives over against those defined in 'Re-Thinking Missions.' 'Except the Lord build the house they labour in vain that build it';

3. The authority of the Bible over against the authority of men. One group says with our Lord—"It is written." The other says—"The best conclusions of the human mind indicate";

4. The liberty into which Christ has brought us over against the bondage which must inevitably result from the interposing of man-made laws between the individual and his Saviour;

5. Eternal union with God in Christ as over against eternal separation from God. 'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.'

The seriousness of the situation, as it is viewed by these elders, is indicated by the fact that they assert: "The issue is broader and deeper and more consequential than the temporary fate of any individual or group of individuals. It involves the very life of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and its organic witness to Jesus Christ."

The committee of Ruling Elders under whose authority this "Testimony" is being sent out also states in its "Covering Letter" that "our beloved church now stands waveringly at a crossroad." We share this conviction. We believe, moreover, that it is within the power of its Ruling Elders to determine, under God, whether the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is to maintain its historic heritage as an evangelical, liberty-loving church. Hence the hope and the concern with which we view the sending out of this "Testimony." The response which the Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. make to this "Testimony" will do much to encourage or much to discourage those who value their Presbyterian heritage and who desire to have it transmitted undiminished to those who shall come after them. Here the principle expressed in the saying of our Lord, "He that is not with me is against me," is applicable rather than that expressed in the saying, "He that is not against us is for us."

NORTHUMBERLAND OVERTURES THE ASSEMBLY TO RESCIND

THE overture adopted by the Presbytery of Northumberland seems to us to possess such excellence that we are herewith printing it in full. This action makes it increasingly certain that the proposal to annul the action of the last Assembly will be one of the major issues, if not the major issue, before the approaching Assembly. The overture follows:

"The Presbytery of Northumberland, in session at Bloomsburg, Pa., this 22nd day of April, 1935, herewith renews its protest against the action of the General Assembly of 1934 against the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, believing that that action was hasty and unconstitutional. This protest we repeat, not only because of our desire to see full justice done to the supporters of the Independent Board, but because of our reverence for the Constitution of our beloved church and our heartfelt desire to see that Constitution upheld. We do solemnly assert our conviction that the unconditional support of the Boards of the church is not one of the constitutional requirements to which ministers, elders, Sessions or Presbyteries must give assent. We do solemnly assert the right and duty of individuals and lower courts to resist a mandate of the General Assembly which em-

bodies the demand for such unconditional support of our agencies, and to insist upon the church's right and duty to criticize, investigate and correct the conduct of any agency. It is our belief that the attempt to silence criticism of our Board of Foreign Missions has been not only un-Presbyterian but unwise, since it has merely resulted in deepening the feeling of distrust in many minds; and that such criticism will inevitably continue until the personnel, principles and methods of the Board of Foreign Missions shall have proven themselves loyal, without qualification, to the doctrinal standards of the church. We point out the significant fact that, though the Board has been under fire for at least fifteen years, no adequate steps have been taken by any General Assembly to make such criticism invalid. The action of the General Assembly of 1933 was by no means adequate. Since that action was taken, renewed attacks have been made upon the Board, attacks which the Board's publications and assertions have not sufficiently answered. It is our solemn conviction that such a crisis is upon the church as should compel this General Assembly to act at once in defense of the Faith and the Constitution.

"We therefore present to the General Assembly of 1935, convened at Cincinnati, Ohio, the following overture:

"The Presbytery of Northumberland, in session at Bloomsburg, Pa., this 23rd day of April, 1935, respectfully requests the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., to rescind the action taken by the previous General Assembly against the members and supporters of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions; and to appoint a Special Committee of fifteen to conduct a thorough investigation of the affairs of the Board of Foreign Missions; such Committee to be composed of men absolutely loyal to our Doctrinal Standards. And we do further request the General Assembly, suspending whatever rule may interfere, to give full opportunity for nominations from the floor, not only for membership on this Special Committee, but for membership on the Board of Foreign Missions and other Boards; and to use every right means to insure the election of this Committee and the Boards of such men and women, and only such, as accept without qualification such doctrines as the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth of our Saviour, His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice, His resurrection and His miracles as being essential to the Word of God and Our Standards and therefore essential to the work of our Board."

"STUDY YOUR BIBLE"

UNDER this title, MR. EDWARD J. YOUNG has written and the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. has published a small but eminently useful and worth-while book (109 pages, \$.75).

This book has as its sub-title, "A Self Study Course for Bible Believing Christians." It has been prepared in the conviction that many would-be students of the Bible neglect its study because they do not know how to go about it. It has been designed for the use of the average person who is willing to spend a few minutes each day in Bible study. Intended primarily for individual study, it is also adapted to the use of Bible classes, study groups, and many prayer meetings. While the book confines itself, formally, to the book of Genesis, material from other Biblical

books that throw light upon the book of Genesis is not neglected. Its value lies not only in its analysis and exposition of the opening book of the Bible but also in the sound methods of Bible study it inculcates. DR. CORNELIUS VAN TIL contributes a foreword in which he says: "If Sunday school teachers and other teachers of the Bible would master the method of Bible study and the principle of sacred history as these appear in the sort of book of Mr. Young, I am persuaded that they would be better fitted to study and teach the Bible than they would if they should read hundreds of pages of the ordinary material now available for them."

It is worthy of remark that this book was prepared by MR. YOUNG while a student of Westminster Seminary. In his introduction he pays a high tribute to the quality of the teaching he has received in that institution, particularly to that by DR. OSWALD T. ALLIS, Professor of Old Testament, "from whose classroom lectures much of the material of this course was obtained." The high esteem in which MR. YOUNG is held by the faculty of Westminster Seminary is indicated by the fact that he is the first to be awarded the Frank H. Stevenson Fellowship established by MRS. STEVENSON in memory of her husband, the first President of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary. This means that MR. YOUNG will continue his studies abroad. The first fruits of his labor indicate that he is a young man from which much may be expected.

THE REPUDIATION OF CHRISTIANITY

RECENT reports from Germany indicate an increasing repudiation of Christianity. It is reported, for instance, that a public assembly was recently held in Berlin, attended by more than 15,000 persons, at which Christianity was denounced as a false religion and the source of most of that country's woes. There are indications that what has happened in Russia may be repeated in large measure in Germany. It is not only in Russia and Germany, however, that there is an increasing repudiation of Christianity on the part of those whose fathers were Christians. We are here dealing with a phenomenon that is finding more or less clear expression in every section of Christendom.

The repudiation of Christianity, reported from Germany, is not made in the interest of atheism as in Russia. While rejecting Christianity in all its forms, it claims to be fundamentally religious. Its religion, however, is rooted in the naturalism of pantheism rather than in the supernaturalism of Christian theism. According to one of its leading spokesmen, "God is immanent in this world and in all periods and has never revealed himself in any final form." The exclusiveness of Christianity, its claim to be the one true and one saving religion, is the point at which it is most violently attacked. It is alleged that God has revealed Himself (or rather itself) through Hitler as well as through Christ, through the history of Germany as fully (or rather more fully) than through the history of the Jews. "Christianity," we read, "says there is only one way to God and whoever does not believe in it is lost. Such a claim leads to confessionalism, from which sprung all the evils that afflicted the religious history of the German people in the past. God has not revealed Himself in the so-called chosen people alone, but also to us through our

Fuehrer, to enable us to accomplish our great mission in the world." This means that whatever elements of truth Christianity may contain, it is discarded as the religion for Germany. While this particular German attack constitutes a flank rather than a frontal attack on Christianity, its repudiation of Christianity is hardly less expressed than that of Soviet Russia.

Far-seeing Christians have long anticipated the present life-and-death struggle for existence in which Christianity now finds itself engaged on practically a world-wide front. It is more than thirty-five years since ABRAHAM KUYPER wrote: "There is no doubt but that Christianity is imperilled by great and serious dangers. Two life systems are wrestling one with the other in mortal combat. Modernism is bound to build a world of its own from the data of the natural man, and to construct man himself from the data of nature; while, on the other hand, all those who reverently bend the knee to Christ and worship Him as the Son of the living God, and God Himself, are bent on saving the 'Christian Heritage.' This is *the* struggle in Europe, this is *the* struggle in America, and this also is the struggle for principles in which Holland is engaged, and in which I myself have been spending all my energy for nearly forty years." No doubt this struggle is not so obvious even yet in America as in lands like Russia and Germany, but, if present tendencies continue, we may be sure it will not be long before Christians in America face conditions like those of their brethren in other lands.


The situation confronting Christianity today has frequently been compared with that which confronted Christianity during the first three centuries of the Christian era. During that period Christianity was engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the paganism of the ancient world. It won that struggle and, broadly speaking, still maintains its supremacy. Within the memory of living men, however, a resurgent paganism, armed with the weapons of a naturalistic philosophy and a naturalistic science, has gained such headway that it is again contesting the right of Christianity further to determine the culture and civilization of the world. The result is, humanly speaking, that Christianity again faces a situation in which it is compelled to fight for its very existence. Many of the great of this world already regard Christianity as a vanished enemy and look forward to a culture and civilization in which its institutions will rest on other than Christian principles and in which the morals and habits of men will be pervaded and controlled by other than a Christian spirit.

Ominous as is the existing situation, it is by no means hopeless. The Scriptures nowhere guarantee that Christianity will not be engaged in as fierce a struggle in its future as in its early days. It is a life of strife and persecution—a cross rather than a crown—that Jesus led His disciples to expect on earth. The existing situation, therefore, does not contradict but is rather in harmony with the prophecies of the Scriptures. We do not pretend to say what the immediate future has in store for Christianity. It may be that in the relatively near future Christians throughout the world will be subjected to persecutions as bad or even worse than those during the first three centuries. Be that as it may, we are confident that Jesus Christ being what He is, the Saviour of the World and the Lord and Life of humanity, His cause will ultimately triumph. The living and reigning Christ is our hope as He is our stay and under His leadership we may be sure of certain though by no means easy victory.

Which Is the Rule of Faith and Life: The Word of God or the Voice of the Church?

By Professor William Childs Robinson, Th.D., D.D., of Columbia
Theological Seminary

[The following article is the body of an address delivered on May 8th at the Gettysburg Presbyterian Church of which its author was pastor for a number of years. Our space limits have necessitated the omission of the introduction]

EAR Christian friends, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is today facing the same question which has agitated the church of our Lord Jesus Christ through most of its history. Shall we heed the voice of God speaking through His Word, the Holy Scriptures; or shall we obey the church speaking through her councils?

Theoretically, your church stands upon the Word of God as the rule of faith and practice. I regret to state, however, that practically she seems to be making the voice of the church her rule of faith and manners. I am aware this is a serious accusation to bring. I can only ask you to weigh the evidence with me and come to your own conclusions as to the truth of the charge.

A change from a practical acquiescence in the dictates of God's Word to an acquiescence in the dogmas of the church is noticeable from about the time of the death of Dr. B. B. Warfield, America's greatest scholar. The Princeton luminary set up his banners expressly in the Word of God. He defended the citadel of the Christian faith by holding even its outworks, every one of the sixty-six books of the Bible. He affirmed that the denominations might fail; but that if they did the Christian faith would still live for the people who had the Bible in their hands, and that if the current churches failed to give them the truth of God new churches would come up from the people who now had the Word of God in their hands.

Like his great Calvinistic predecessor at Union, New York, Dr. W. G. T. Shedd, Dr. Warfield opposed mystic mergers of denominations because he feared that these unions would obscure the testimony of the Reformed Faith to the whole truth of God's Word. When the 1920 Assembly proposed a plan of union, Dr. Warfield vigorously attacked it as not sufficiently safeguarding the distinctive truths of the Christian religion and the distinctive truths of Calvinism. In this his last fight for the faith, Dr. Warfield had the help of the man who has recently been condemned by New Brunswick Presbytery, Dr. J. Gresham Machen; while aligned against Dr. Warfield were those men who now dominate Princeton Theological Seminary and New Brunswick Presbytery.

On the day after Christmas 1923, a number of ministers, ultimately about thirteen hundred, covenanted together in

the Auburn Affirmation to support and defend candidates seeking admission to the ministry who were unable to accept either or all of the following doctrines: the Virgin Birth, the bodily resurrection of Christ, Christ's miracles, the full truthfulness of Scripture, and that Christ offered up Himself as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God. Heeding this influential *voice of the Church* to the disregard of the plain teaching of the Word of God concerning the Virgin Birth of Christ, the General Assemblies in the period 1925-1930 allowed several men who had offended against the plain teachings of Scripture on this article of faith to go unpunished. Hearing the same influential voice of the Church, seminaries and mission agencies placed Auburn Affirmationists upon their boards of control and upon their secretarial forces. Three years ago the Presbytery in Washington, D. C., licensed for mission work a minister who could not accept the Virgin Birth. In his defense it was stated that certain former moderators thought that he ought to be licensed. Again the voice of the church rather than the Word of God decided the matter.

The vice-president of the Foreign Mission Board, Mr. James M. Speers, became a director of the laymen's inquiry which issued the notorious book, *Rethinking Missions*. Mr. Speers, has continued his support of the position taken in this book. The Foreign Board is also supporting union enterprises such as Nanking University which has used as text-books such Modernistic books as Fosdick's *The Modern Use of the Bible*, and G. A. Barton's *Jesus of Nazareth*. Indeed, the Board has itself circulated a volume written for Dr. Fosdick's Modernistic congregation, Miss Kirkland's *Way of Discovery*. As we read the contra-scriptural statements in these volumes, we are again driven to the conclusion that the Presbyterian Church is not heeding the Word of God, but hearing instead the voice of the church.

Another example, Presbyterian seminaries in the last decade have put into their faculties a scholar whose writings expressly contradict the teaching of the Bible as presented in the Westminster Confession of Faith on the subject of the will of fallen man, Ch. IX, Sec. iii, iv; Ch. X, Sec. ii; and on the subject of the sovereignty of God, Ch. III, Sec. i, ii. Nor can it be said in this case that the

institutions were unaware of these teachings. The last institution to elect this theological professor published, in its bulletin chronicling the election, the name of the article *Free Will*, which in the teachings above enumerated is definitely contraconfessional and anticalvinistic. I forbear to characterize these actions: because, for one thing, I lack that prestige necessary to give my characterization force. And for another reason, because such actions have already been characterized by Dr. Charles Hodge, perhaps the greatest name in the annals of one of these seminaries and still *nomen clarissimum* in the other. That Dr. Hodge testifies on these particular departures from what Presbyterians understand the Scriptures to teach is not an inference. His explicit teachings thereon are found in his volume *Church Polity* (Scribners), pp. 333, 336-340, 337; as well as his unambiguous characterization of such action. If they will not hear Dr. Hodge, they certainly will not hear me. But we can at least discern that this action is another example of listening to the voice of the church rather than to the Word of God. Men are not chosen on the basis of their loyalty to what the Presbyterian Church believes the Bible to teach when their known articles contradict that doctrine in such important doctrines as the doctrine of man and the doctrine of God—doctrines which logically affect every major *loci* of theology. Such a choice must rather be made on the basis that the one elected commends himself to the church by his erudition, personal charm, attractive address or other popular qualifications. This example, therefore, rather forcibly confirms the implication of the statement made by the president of one of the above-mentioned seminaries to the Baltimore Assembly that his seminary must represent the entire church.

JUDICIAL DECISIONS

However, the clearest evidence of the drift from the Word of God to the Voice of the Church in the U.S.A. Assembly is to be found by contrasting two judicial decisions, the one by the General Assembly of 1925 affecting Dr. Henry Van Dusen and the one by New Brunswick Presbytery in 1935 affecting Dr. J. Gresham Machen.

These two men have some things in common. Each of them is a professor in a theological seminary operating independently of the General Assembly, but training Presbyterian ministers. Dr. Van Dusen is dean in the "liberal" seminary, Union, New York. Dr. Machen is chairman of the faculty in the conservative seminary, Westminster. Dr. Van Dusen failed to accept the ruling of several General Assemblies that the Virgin Birth was a doctrine essential to ministerial licensure. Dr. Machen refused to accept the decision of one General Assembly that the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions disband. Each, therefore, disobeyed mandates of the General Assembly. But here the similarity ceases.

Dr. Van Dusen was not condemned for refusing to accept the mandate of the Assemblies. His case was examined fully and fairly by the inferior judicatories. His defenders were allowed by the presbytery, synod, and assembly to point out that an *in thesi* deliverance of the Assembly has not the force of either a judicial decision or an addition to the Constitution. New York Presbytery was not ultimately condemned for violating a decision of the General Assembly in licensing Dr. Van Dusen when he could not accept the Virgin Birth. The Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly which decided this judicial case held that the candidate was unable to affirm his belief of the facts set forth in the narratives of the Virgin Birth in Matthew and Luke and hence could not properly have taken the first vow required for licensure and for ordination. In other words, Dr. Van Dusen was held to have offended against the Word of God as the rule of faith. He was guilty of an offense according to the plain teachings of the Constitution. If the Word of God were the practical rule of faith and manners, then we would expect as the next chapter in Presbyterian history the visiting of an ecclesiastical penalty upon Dr. Van Dusen. That was ten years ago. Yet not a single church censure has ever been visited upon Dr. Van Dusen for this position which in a regularly appealed judicial action was adjudged an offense against the Word of God. Why? An influential voice of the church composed of thirteen hundred ministers bound in a covenant known as the Auburn Affirmation were and are supporting Dr. Van Dusen. Therefore, the leaders of the U.S.A. church so compromised the matter that Dr. Van Dusen has received no ecclesiastical censure. In this case the voice of the church carried against the doctrine of the Word of God.

Now let us look at the case of Dr. Gresham Machen. The fact that Dr. Machen is a noteworthy scholar and defender of the faith is no reason that he or his actions should be regarded as sacrosanct. Total depravity inheres in every son of Adam. Every Presbyterian is subject to the discipline of the church. The only question is: Has that discipline been rightly or properly administered? Did Dr. Machen the conservative receive as fair a consideration as did Dr. Van Dusen the "liberal"?

Every Presbyterian minister in his person and in his acts is subject to Presbyterian discipline. Thus, the members of the Independent Board are personally subject to trial for any acts contrary to the Word of God which they severally commit as members of that Board. But it may well be doubted whether an organization set up independent of the Assembly is itself subject to the action of the General Assembly. Past General Assemblies censured Dr. Briggs, a Presbyterian minister, for doctrines which he held and taught in Union Seminary. They did not declare that Union Seminary, an independent institution, must be

abolished. Mr. James Speers as a Presbyterian could be tried for his acts in producing *Rethinking Missions*. But it is inconceivable that the General Assembly would say to any one of the several organizations which have fostered the point of view of the laymen's inquiry that you must dissolve.

Instead of suggesting to the inferior judicatories that they examine the several members of the Independent Board to find out by judicial action whether they had severally been guilty of censure in their actions as members of this board, the General Assembly of 1934 without the semblance of a judicial trial ordered the Board to dissolve. Thereafter, New Brunswick Presbytery found Dr. Machen guilty, not of any actions or beliefs contrary to Scripture, but of disobeying the *in thesi* mandate of the Assembly. Not only that, but it refused to his counsel the right to point out the unconstitutional character of this deliverance. The rights which were preserved Dr. Van Dusen were expressly denied Dr. Machen. The course of the procedure in Dr. Machen's case was first legislative outlawry and then secondly judicial condemnation for disobeying this legal mandate. The mandate has been treated as a part of the Constitution, as though the General Assembly could add to the Constitution without the consent of the presbyteries; a procedure which is directly contrary to the rules of the Constitution, *Form of Government*, Ch. XXIV. Indeed, the course of procedure in the case of Dr. Machen closely parallels that which would be termed in civil jurisprudence a bill of attainder; one which the Constitution of the United States, Art. I, Sec. 9, Par. 3, specifically forbids to the Congress of the United States.

More fundamental still, *the opinion and judgment of the Judicial Commission of New Brunswick Presbytery* can be scanned minutely without finding a single quotation from or citation of Scripture. According to the U.S.A. *Book of Discipline* the primary meaning of an offense is that which is contrary to the teaching of Scripture; according to the co-ordinate southern Presbyterian book the exclusive meaning of an offense is that which is contrary to Scripture. And here is a minister suspended from his office by a decision that alleges not a single syllable of Scripture violated by him. Dr. Van Dusen violates the teaching of Matthew and Luke and goes free; Dr. Machen violates no Scripture and is suspended! Why? What has Dr. Machen violated? He has violated the voice of the church, speaking in the Assembly of 1934. His counsel have been denied the right of arguing the constitutionality of this law of the Assembly. He has broken the law of the Assembly. That is enough. The law of the Assembly, the voice of the church, is ultimate.

I submit, brethren, that I have proved my contention. Practically, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is making the voice of the church rather than the Word of God the rule of faith and practice. A "liberal"

refuses to accept the Virgin Birth plainly taught in Matthew and Luke and goes scot-free. That which is an offense against the Word of God no longer carries a penalty. A conservative refuses to accept a legislative mandate against an organization which is independent of the Assembly and he is ordered suspended from the ministry. That which is not even alleged to be an offense against the Word of God carries the penalty of suspension and the threat of deposition. In the crucial test of judicial procedure, the U.S.A. church has set up the voice of the church in place of the Word of God as the standard by which to measure offenses, and hence as the rule of faith and practice.

Those who enjoy a bit of irony may notice that the same General Assembly of 1934, which laid its iron mandate to bind the conscience of Dr. Machen, passed a resolution commending the German Protestants for refusing to obey those actions of the Nazi church which contravene a minister's exclusive allegiance to the Word of God. With a much more vague and less adequate understanding of what the Word of God is, Karl Barth is indeed challenging the German church with the same issue that the Machen case has raised in the U.S.A. church. Is the voice of the church the ultimate; or is it only penultimate, with the Word of God ultimate? Is not the Word of God above the church judging her? Barth rightly declares that the material as well as the formal principle of the Reformed Reformation is neither this or that particular doctrine; but a doctrine that is primal for all doctrine, namely, that God is the sole author of doctrine. God is speaking, hear Him. The Word of God is ultimate; the church must bow to it.

Supporting Barth's contention, Dr. Adolph Keller frequently refers to a story from Dostoevsky in *The Brothers Karamasov*:

Jesus has come back to Seville to preach the gospel again. He is at once arrested and put into prison. Deep in the night the old Grand Inquisitor meets Him and asks Him: "Why didst Thou come back? Thou has left Thy task to Thy church. And we know much better how to accomplish it than Thou. We know better how to handle the world and the people. Leave us alone and come never more." To which Keller adds: "This is the great danger of our church: to know better than Christ, to fulfill His task with our social programs, in our missionary activity, in our art of preaching and teaching, in our theological formulas, and to forget that He is the Master and Lord to whom we owe obedience before we go to work out our sublime moral and social and religious programs."

Shall we stand for the authority of the Word of God in Germany; and the authority of the voice of the Church in America? Or shall we return to the sole Headship of Christ in His church, and the sufficiency of His Word as a rule of faith and practice?

Unscientific "Rethinking"

By L. Nelson Bell, M.D., F.A.C.S.

(Of the Tsingkiangpu General Hospital, China)

WHEN "Rethinking Missions" was sensationally released to the press and later published in book form in 1932, evangelical Christians throughout the world were amazed and distressed that such a book should be gotten out in the name of Christianity and in the guise of a scientifically prepared, factually based, report the *only** hope of eternal life, evangelical Christians have turned from it and relegated it to its proper position in the essentially anti-Christian literature of the day.

At this late date, however, it is still relevant to make public some recent findings regarding this Inquiry, especially as only recently the Modern Missions Movement has been started to promote missions along the recommendations of "Rethinking Missions." The above-mentioned findings prove that in reporting on Medical Missions, "Rethinking Missions" was not scientifically prepared, nor was it factually based. It is the purpose of this article to prove this statement beyond the peradventure of a doubt.

On the Commission there were two Doctors of Medicine; Dr. Henry S. Houghton, at that time Dean of the Medical College of the University of Iowa—formerly Director of the Peiping Union Medical College, and at the present time again connected with that institution—and Dr. Charles Phillips Emerson, Professor of Medicine and Dean of the Medical School of the University of Indiana. In addition to the Commission, there was a Fact Finders' group which preceded the Commission to the field and to which was intrusted the securing of the data for its use. In this group of Fact Finders was Dr. William G. Lennox, a capable and experienced physician and statistician, who undertook the ascertaining of the facts regarding medical mission work in China.

When "Rethinking Missions" was published and the chapter on "Medical Work of Missions," presumably written by Drs. Houghton and Emerson, was read, the overwhelming majority of missionary doctors were distressed and indignant at the unfair presentation of the subject and the warped idea this report gave of actual work being done. Many of us knew that our own hospitals had not been visited and felt, probably subconsciously, that our work was not involved because of this fact.

Within three months of the time that "Rethinking Missions" was published and copies arrived in China, the writer of this article made an effort to ascertain how many hospitals had actually been visited by some member of the Commission, but was unable to do so and let the matter drop. Last fall, however, reports came of the forming in America of the Modern Missions Movement as a result of the recommendations of "Rethinking Missions." I of a group who had undertaken to ascertain the facts of

present-day Christian missions and report these facts to the world.

Because of the denial, in this book, of the unique position of the Christian religion, in that Christ is the one and *only** Saviour, the *only** means of salvation from sin, immediately wrote to Drs. Houghton and Emerson and asked them how many mission hospitals they had actually visited in China. Dr. Houghton did not reply, probably due to his moving from Iowa back to Peiping about that time, although his former secretary wrote me that she had forwarded my letter to him. Dr. Emerson replied as follows:

"DEAR DR. BELL:

In reply to your letter of October 30th, I regret that I have not at hand a list of all the hospitals which our commission visited. Nevertheless, either Dr. Lennox, Dr. Houghton or myself visited every American supported hospital in China, as well as those supported by other missions in England and many of the private and national hospitals.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES P. EMERSON."

Upon receipt of this letter from Dr. Emerson, I sent out a questionnaire to all mission hospitals in China, asking whether they had been visited by any of the three doctors mentioned. A total of 220 letters were sent out. To date a total of 173 hospitals have been heard from, with the following answers:

Visited by one or more of these three doctors..	34
Not visited	138
Declined to state	1

An analysis of the 47 hospitals not heard from shows that, due to their geographical relationship to those hospitals which have reported, possibly 6 of them were visited. In the same way it can be deduced that 41 certainly were not visited.

As a result of the above, it is possible definitely to state that a *maximum* of 40 of the 220 hospitals were visited while 180 were not visited.

A further analysis shows that what hospitals were visited were along the China coast from Canton to Shanghai, a few up the Yangtze as far as Hankow, and a few on the railway from Nanking to Peiping. Scores of outstanding mission hospitals which were accessible were passed by.

There is no intention whatsoever to place Dr. Emerson in an unfair light. It is certain that he *thought* all of the hospitals had been visited, but the fact remains that out of 220 hospitals 180 were *not visited*. This startling *fact* does not add to the confidence one might have in the report of Drs. Houghton and Emerson as found in "Rethinking Missions."

* John 14: 6, John 3: 36, Mark 16: 16, Acts 4: 12, I Tim. 2: 5.

But the questionnaire sent out has revealed another point. Neither Dr. Houghton or Dr. Emerson visited all of these 40 hospitals by any means. The answers are not all specific but a number state that Dr. Lennox alone visited them. It should be noted that the visits paid by Dr. Lennox were generally considered thorough and satisfactory by the heads of the hospitals concerned. Such was not always the case where either Dr. Houghton or Dr. Emerson was the visitor.

One doctor writes, "A mighty superficial visit."

Another, "Dr. — called at our hospital for five minutes only to *call on me personally*. . . . He saw my office only."

Another, "I may say that while enjoying the visit socially it seems to me that in spite of all my efforts to state my opinions to Dr. — he spent most of the time trying to make me say things which he had decided I should say."

Another, "Dr. — was with us between trains on the same day."

Another, "They were in this city and asked business firms of our hospital but *did not visit us*."

Another, "Dr. — was here one Sunday morning, said, 'I have only half an hour, between trains.'"

Another, "We were disappointed they did not come, Dr. — was quoted as saying he knew our situation."

General comments by doctors replying to the questionnaire were too numerous and voluminous to quote, but the following are given as samples:

"I hope you will expose the flagrant, unscientific jumping at conclusions of that Commission."

"I also was filled with a bit of righteous indignation at the prolific employment of exaggerated generalizations."

"Many times have I wished some one would challenge those — to name any single hospital where one man has ever seen 500 patients in a day, to say nothing of seeing that number every day. Once in my life time I have seen 120, but never again for their sakes as well as mine. But 500 every day!!!"

"The Findings are hardly in the Spirit of Christ or His Commission, nor in keeping with the friends in the homeland who give their money for *Christian* medical work or *Medical Mission* work."

There might be a possible shadow of an excuse if Drs. Houghton and Emerson had had only their superficial visit to rely on (according to the Foreword of "Rethinking Missions" the Commission spent *two weeks* for all of mid-China, including the great Yangtze basin, their headquarters being Shanghai), but after reading their report, as found in "Rethinking Missions," and then reading Dr. Lennox's findings in the Fact Finders' report on China (Volume V, Supplementary Series, Part II), based on some thirty visits to mission hospitals, 120 replies to an extensive questionnaire sent out to 235 mission hospitals, and the *Prayer Cycle* of the China Medical Association, which contained statistics for *practically every mission hospital in China*, one is forced to the conclusion that Drs.

Houghton and Emerson practically *ignored the findings of their own representative in that group*.

To make the above point clear let us compare some of the statements of the two books.

On page 202 of "Rethinking Missions," Drs. Houghton and Emerson report, "The story of a typical American mission hospital will illustrate how quality in medical work is easily lost," and then they describe the "typical" mission hospital and doctor as follows, "During the busy seasons, aided by his assistants, head nurse and even his evangelist, he may prescribe for five hundred, or even a thousand, out-patients in one morning."

On the other hand, on page 455 in the above-mentioned volume, Dr. Lennox gives the average number of out-patients treated daily, per doctor, in mission hospitals at *fourteen*. This figure is arrived at from carefully compiled statistics from practically every mission hospital in China. The two statements should be noted, for one finds the difference,—that between "14" and "500-1000."

The "typical" hospital mentioned by Drs. Houghton and Emerson does not exist in China, and the exaggerations in that account are too obvious to be taken up, were it not for the fact that they have been given such wide publicity.

But to compare again: On page 203 of "Rethinking Missions," speaking of the same "typical" hospital, this assertion is made, "Correct diagnoses are not attempted; important early diseases—cancer, tuberculosis, and the like—are overlooked."

In Dr. Lennox's report though, on page 470, we find that the overwhelming majority of all mission hospitals are equipped for routine, laboratory, and other examinations for patients, and on page 471, regarding the use of this equipment, he says, "In comparison with hospitals in America, the proportion (in respect to urine examinations) of special examinations, especially serum tests for syphilis, is *undoubtedly high*." (Italics ours.)

Again, on page 201 of "Rethinking Missions" it is stated, "The days of the pioneer are past and the professional work of the modern mission medical centers is too often inferior to the nearby government and other non-missionary hospitals."

Over against this, we find on page 476 of Dr. Lennox's report, under the head of "Governmental Hospitals," "Such hospitals are under military, the central or provisional government or the municipality. One military hospital was visited, that at Nanchang, Kiangsi Province. This contained 1,000 sick and wounded soldiers lying on closely packed board beds in unheated Chinese buildings, attended by a medical staff of the dresser type, and without visible charts, nurses, operating room, X-ray or laboratory. There are a few Government hospitals and dispensaries for civilians. The Central Hospital in Nanking, is in every respect up to date and modern. The annual cost of maintenance is Mex. \$1,430 per bed. The average cost in mission hospitals, including foreign salaries, but not including the interest on investment, is Mex. \$401 per bed. The two National University hospitals visited were also first class. *These three*

about exhaust the list of good Government hospitals." (Italics ours.)

"Provincial and municipal hospitals, of which nine were visited, were invariably primitive affairs *far below the standard of missionary hospitals in the same localities.*" (Italics ours.)

And on page 477, referring to private hospitals, Dr. Lennox says, "We visited a dozen or more. *They can be called hospitals only by courtesy.*" (Italics ours.)

"Rethinking Missions" says mission hospitals are "too often" inferior to near-by government and other hospitals. Dr. Lennox says there are three good Government hospitals in China, that provincial and municipal hospitals are "invariably primitive affairs far below the standard of missionary hospitals in the same localities" and that private hospitals can be "called hospitals only by courtesy." Please pardon the repetition, but the above is interesting.

The picture of the average missionary doctor in "Rethinking Missions" is not a very attractive one. On page 201 it is stated, "The impression gained from our study of the clinical work of American missions [*i.e.*, the professional work of the doctors. L.N.B.] in the Orient was in general one of disappointment."

Over against this we find Dr. Lennox's writing as follows on the same subject, page 500, "On the average, the missionary institutions excelled in the *quality of professional service*, in medical equipment *and its use*, in the nursing care of the patients, in the housekeeping of the hospital, and in the human interest in the patients and in stability of the work." On page 493 of the same report we find, "There is no major surgery being done outside of mission and a *few other hospitals.*" (Italics ours.)

In the above connection it is permissible to quote from another member of the Fact Finders' group, a layman, who went to Szechwan Province for the Commission and reported on various phases of mission work in that province. On page 605 of the same volume already quoted, in speaking of medical work in Szechwan this layman begins his first paragraph with this sentence, "It is the impression of the writer that the average of skill and knowledge among missionary doctors is distinctly higher than the average in America."

Drs. Houghton and Emerson are not content with their critical attitude to the clinical work in mission hospitals; they also strike at the essential missionary purpose of these hospitals. Inferior clinical methods and slovenly diagnosis and treatment of cases cannot be too severely condemned, either in America or China, but the aggressive presentation of the gospel message in mission hospitals, whether by indirect impressions through the Christian character of the staff, personal work with the patients, or preaching in the wards and chapels, is not incompatible with first-class scientific medicine and surgery. In fact, it is a tremendous asset.

On page 199 of "Rethinking Missions," we find these words, "The use of medical skill for ulterior ends has been rightly challenged, in our judgment, by social and religious

leaders in India and China." On page 200 we read, "By many missionaries the use of medical service as an evangelizing device is earnestly defended. . . . On the other hand, enlightened non-Christians frequently express their scorn of institutions which proselytize the sick and helpless, who are least able to resist." On page 201 we read further, "But the use of medical or other professional service as a direct means of making converts, or public services in wards and dispensaries from which patients cannot escape, is subtly coercive, and improper."

Obviously, Drs. Houghton and Emerson have forgotten that the gospel means "good news." There can be no possible excuse for undue pressure or tactlessness in preaching to patients, but most of us are not concerned with the opinions of non-Christians in this matter, nor do we consider it "subtly coercive" or "improper" to use our hospitals as direct evangelistic agencies. We have the precedent and example of the Saviour Himself, while most of the money contributed for medical missions has come from those who expect the message of spiritual healing to go hand in hand with physical healing. Failure in this would be a denial of Him and a betrayal of those who support us. One regrets, too, the statement regarding the "typical" mission hospital on page 203 where, speaking of the outpatients, it is said, "Too many . . . leave with a good Bible text and the wrong medicine."

Compared to the above, we have Dr. Lennox's fair statement of the question on page 472 of his report, "Medical missionaries enlist with the understanding that they are both to preach the Gospel and to heal the sick. They expect to win converts to the Christian religion from among patients, nurses, and doctors in the hospital, and from students in the medical schools. The patients who throng missionary hospitals number more than a million a year, more than twice as many as the Protestant church membership of China. They are receiving a service of recognized value and they easily recognize the manner in which such service is given. The attitude of most missionaries is that of the father of modern surgery, Ambrose Paré: 'I dress the wound, God heals it,' or again, 'Pity as an emotion passes, pity as a motive remains.'"

"Most doctors believe that in their medical service they are fulfilling an essential portion of their mission. Of all doctors who answered the question, 'In your work as a medical missionary, which do you regard as the most important, the proper medical care of the patient or efforts towards his evangelization?' the largest number, 67 per cent, replied that both were equally important and could not be separated."

Additional comparisons between "Rethinking Missions" and the report of the Fact Finders could be made, but the ones made are sufficient.

The missionary doctors of China had the right to expect from the doctors on the Laymen's Inquiry the same quality of scientific purpose and method in this Inquiry which was demanded of them in their medical missionary work. Failure to use scientific methods, hasty and wrong diag-

noses, faulty treatments of patients, all of these and other things are placed to the discredit of mission doctors in "Rethinking Missions." And yet, we find those who demand such high standards guilty of making a *generalized report on 220 mission hospitals when they had visited not more than 40 of these hospitals*, in fact, a number of these forty visits were made by a third person. We find also that one of the two doctors on the Inquiry *thought* all had been visited, only being 81 per cent *wrong* in this belief. In the third place, we find them ignoring the findings of their own representative on the Fact Finders' Commission. In the fourth place, we find them making statements which are directly *contrary* to those made by their Fact Finder. Truly, they were guilty of the "prolific employment of exaggerated generalizations."

In the defense of the parts of the report quoted, as found in "Rethinking Missions," some may say that as the Inquiry also visited India, this report is for India and China combined. This is true, but it is utterly unscientific to have done so. Suppose a doctor examined two patients, one with pulmonary tuberculosis, the other suffering with acute appendicitis, and then after the examination he renders a *composite* report and diagnosis on the two cases? Even a missionary doctor in China would not be guilty of this. For the laymen in America to have had a clear pic-

ture of the situations in the two countries, the reports should have been entirely separate, just as the Fact Finders made their report.

If a large business corporation had sent out certain representatives to secure facts on which to project its future work, and these representatives had made their report as the medical report in "Rethinking Missions" was made, some of the officials of that corporation would certainly ask some very searching questions of their own. The most charitable thing one can say about this medical report is that it is a *biased statement, the result of certain preconceptions and prejudices, plus a failure to make use of the facts which were in hand*. In other words, the statement made in the beginning of this paper is true—the report on Medical Missions in "Rethinking Missions" *was not scientifically prepared, nor was it factually based*.

If laymen of America propose to foster and support the Modern Missions Movement with the aim of carrying out the recommendations of "Rethinking Missions," they certainly have the right to do so. At the same time, there are a great many hospitals in China which hope to continue doing the very best scientific work possible with limited budgets, equipment, and staffs, but which at the same time propose to continue to *preach* and *live* Jesus Christ as the one and only Saviour from sin.

A Testimony of Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

THE purpose of this testimony is to record the convictions of the subscribing Ruling Elders bearing upon certain trends and conditions in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America which we view with grave concern and believe to be impairing the witness of our church and its purity, peace and unity.

First: We believe that doctrinal differences lie at the heart of and furnish the motivating cause for the present discord in our church, and that issues having the aspect of administrative and governmental matters are only collateral manifestations and outgrowths of fundamental and irreconcilable differences in belief. We believe that the real disturbers of the peace of our church are those who question or deny and not those who conscientiously defend the doctrinal standards as expressed in our Confession of Faith and Catechisms as historically understood. We believe that we as Ruling Elders can best express our loyalty to our church by an unflinching, fearless, consistent and outspoken loyalty to our divine Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in our several places and in the Courts of our church. We pray that in our desire always to be loyal to Jesus Christ we may never be diverted or misled and our testimony eclipsed by considerations of loyalty to or dislike for particular individuals who for the time stand for the principles at issue.

Second: We testify to our belief that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and that the system of doctrine set forth in the Confession of Faith of our church is the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.

Third: We testify to our belief that the following are essential doctrines of the Word of God, and that our General Assembly in its deliverance of 1910 (reaffirmed in similar language by the General Assemblies of 1916 and 1923) did right in declaring that:

1. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide and move the writers of Holy Scriptures to keep them from error.

2. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary.

3. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and to reconcile us to God.

4. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, that on the third day He rose again from the dead with the same body with which He suffered, with which also He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of His Father, making intercession.

5. "It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God as the supreme standard of our faith that our Lord Jesus showed His power and love by working mighty miracles. This working was not contrary to nature, but superior to it."

We believe that under our Creedal professions these are truths essential to the soundness "in the faith" of "all who are admitted as teachers" in our church and that they are not "truths and forms with respect to which" a fair and reasonable construction of our Standards permits such teachers to differ. (Form of Gov't. Ch. I, Sec. V.) We believe that Christian living is the fruit of Christian belief, and "that no opinion can be more pernicious or more absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are" on these truths. (Form of Gov't. Ch. I, Sec. IV.) We firmly believe that a frank recognition by our church of the irreconcilable and mutually destructive nature of the difference which separates those who accept these truths from those who

either reject them or regard them as non-essential, and the adoption of a firm and consistent position with regard to them are essential to true unity and peace in our beloved Church.

Fourth: We testify to our conviction that so long as we continue to be ordained officers in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. fidelity to our vows and plain common honesty with the world and before God require adherence to our creedal professions and earnest opposition to "Modernism" in the church. Any claim of liberty, for ourselves or others who have so vowed, to proclaim beliefs or indulge in practices contrary to these professions, causes grave and irreparable injury to the cause of Jesus Christ, and disturbs the peace and impairs the unity and purity of the church.

Fifth: We testify, of course, to our cheerful willingness to submit to all rightful and scriptural ecclesiastical authority as defined in, and lawfully exercised in manner and scope as provided by, the Constitution of our church, consisting of (1) The Confession of Faith; (2) The Larger Catechism; (3) The Shorter Catechism; (4) The Form of Government; (5) The Book of Discipline; and (6) The Directory for the Worship of God.

Sixth: We long for such a condition of the Boards and Agencies of our church that they can be heartily and unrestrictedly supported financially and in other ways by orthodox people in the church. We long for a time when such support of the Boards and Agencies of the church shall be enthusiastic, sacrificial in extent, and prompted solely by a desire to do our full part in advancing the coming of the Kingdom of God. Accordingly we deplore as being unscriptural, un-Presbyterian, degrading to the givers and ultimately destructive to the work itself, anything which may be construed as an ecclesiastical requirement that any definite, officially designated agency must be supported by a member to preserve his good standing in the church, regardless of the giver's individual and conscientious convictions as to its faithfulness to the Word of God, its worthiness or effectiveness.

"Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver." (II Cor. 9, 7.)

On the contrary we testify to the full acceptance of the truth expressed in Section II, Chapter XX of our Confession of Faith that:

"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith and worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also."

Illustrative of the conditions, trends and departures from sound Scriptural and Presbyterian principles which cause us to view the present and the future with grave concern, is the action of the 1934 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. which approved or adopted certain principles that were apparently deemed necessary to enable it to order certain Ministers and members of the church to sever their connection with the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions under pain of ecclesiastical discipline. Specifically we believe there is fundamental error in the realm of government in the assertion that:

"It (the General Assembly) has all the power the church would have if it were possible to convene the church together in one place. All its acts, therefore, are acts of the whole church . . ." (Part I, p. 80 Minutes 1934.)

We believe the General Assembly is subject to the Constitution just as is the Session, Presbytery or Synod, and that it exceeds its lawful power when it undertakes to deal with any matters in a manner contrary to that prescribed in the Constitution or where the effect of its conclusion is to amend or change the Constitution itself. Obviously for any Court of final jurisdiction to characterize in advance of trial defined conduct as constituting a punishable offense is to make a mockery of the orderly and

serious business of process, trial and defense, and to deprive, if effective, the Judicial Commissions of original and appellate jurisdiction of the opportunity of reaching a conclusion in the light of the evidence. The security of the humblest member of the church is involved here, because if the principle announced by the 1934 General Assembly is valid he lives in the constant jeopardy of having his most conscientious conduct declared an offense by General Assembly fiat and all escape from ecclesiastical discipline denied. We believe the security of the individual and the willing and happy submission of Presbyterians to ecclesiastical authority demand that the safeguards of open and fair trial for alleged offenses be preserved in spirit and in fact as well as in form. The Constitutional guaranty of protection against tyranny and abuse through open, fair and impartial trial cannot be replaced by a blind and implicit confidence in the fairness of changing and hurried assemblies of men dealing with generalities.

If the effect of a General Assembly deliverance is to add anything to or subtract anything from the Constitution, it is obvious that such deliverance is void and of no effect because the Constitution reserves ultimately to the Presbyteries the power of amendment. To assert in such case that the General Assembly has all the power the church would have if it were possible to convene the church together in one place, is to remove from the Presbyteries such amending power. It would seem obvious that the question as to whether a General Assembly deliverance does or does not add to or subtract anything from the Constitution should be a judicial question as to which individual opinion should not be estopped until determined by due and deliberate judicial proceedings by some proper judicatory or Commission other than the one whose action is involved.

We believe there was further fundamental error in the assertion by the 1934 Assembly of the principle that:

"A church member or an individual church that will not give to promote the officially authorized missionary program of the Presbyterian Church is in exactly the same position with reference to the Constitution of the church as a church member or an individual church that would refuse to take part in the celebration of the Lord's Supper or any other of the prescribed ordinances of the denomination as set forth in Chapter VII of the Form of Government"—(Minutes p. 110); and again (Minutes p. 114):

"There is, therefore, no abridgement of personal liberty when the Presbyterian Church *demand*s of its members who have voluntarily attached themselves to it, and are thereby under its Constitution, to honor, sustain and extend the church of their choice in the manner the Constitution itself prescribes."

As to this "manner" of sustenance, and the *extent* of a member's obligation to support financially the officially organized missionary program, the General Assembly ordered (Minutes p. 116):

"That each Presbytery be and hereby is instructed to inform the ministers and sessions of the particular churches under its jurisdiction that it is the primary responsibility and privilege of all those affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to sustain *to the full measure of their ability* those Boards and Agencies which the General Assembly under its Constitutional authority has established and approved for the extension of the Kingdom of Christ at home and abroad." (Italics ours.)

We cannot agree that if we reduce our ability to sustain the official Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church by dropping a coin on the drum of the Salvation Army or by financially supporting any agency other than those established and approved by the General Assembly for the "extension of the Kingdom of Christ *at home or abroad*" we are subject to Presbyterian discipline because we have failed "to the full measure of our ability" to take part in the prescribed ordinances of our church.

We would say in summary that we regard the action of the 1934 General Assembly and the principles above alluded to and

adopted or approved by it to be opposed to the Word of God and the Constitution of our church and as being therefore null and void, for the following reasons, among others:

(a) The action of the General Assembly exalts the changing programs of human councils to a position of authority which rightfully, and in accordance with the Constitution of our church, belongs only to the Word of God.

(b) The action of the General Assembly attacks the great principle of liberty in giving since it makes support of particular missionary programs and Agencies a duty enforceable by ecclesiastical penalties.

(c) The action of the General Assembly ignores the evidences of Modernism in the program and policies of the Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and particularly in the Board of Foreign Missions, and fails to institute the radical reform of those Boards and Agencies which will be necessary before they can receive the unrestricted and hearty support and confidence of orthodox Presbyterians.

Seventh: We testify to our gratitude to God for the rich heritage and the great historic witness of our church; and for that great number of consecrated and loyal Ministers and Missionaries of the gospel who today labor among and for us with sacrifice and faithfulness to perpetuate worthily that heritage and witness. We would by this testimony bring to them some evidence of the fruitfulness in us of their labors, and such courage and resolution for their remaining tasks as may properly come from the approbation and support of men. We urge all who have a sincere concern that our church may be used for the full proclamation of the Gospel of Salvation, to join with us in special and earnest prayer that we and all other Ruling Elders in our church may be moved under the power and guidance of the Holy Spirit to be diligent, active, studious and wise in the full discharge of all the duties of our office, and that the fruit of the Spirit may be made manifest to all the world by our church, and by all persons who participate in every one of its judicatories, boards, agencies and councils.

"... the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering,

gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law." (Gal. V, 22-23.)

Signature.....
Address.....
.....
Church.....
Presbytery.....
Synod.....
Dated.....

[The National Committee of elders includes the following persons: Benjamin F. Edwards, Chairman, St. Louis, Mo.; Irwin H. Linton, Vice-Chairman, Washington, D. C.; Allan D. Wallis, Secretary, Philadelphia, Pa.; Roland K. Armes, Lansdowne, Pa.; Clarence E. Ashworth, Palo Alto, Calif.; Charles C. Boggs, Denver, Colo.; Frank R. Buckalew, Berkeley, Calif.; John McT. Carson, Duluth, Minn.; Dr. W. A. Chamberlin, Collingswood, N. J.; David Collingwood, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Robert D. Dalzell, Pittsburgh, Pa.; John R. Dickie, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Roland M. Eavenson, Lansdowne, Pa.; B. L. Eddy, Roseburg, Oregon; James E. Faw, Westfield, N. J.; John M. Forsyth, M.D., Long Beach, Calif.; J. Gardner Gwinn, Seattle, Wash.; John C. Hershey, Wallingford, Pa.; Franklin T. Hickcox, Tacoma, Wash.; Philip E. Howard, Philadelphia; Charles L. Huston, Coatesville, Pa.; John Inglis, M.D., Denver, Colo.; Samuel Iredell, Bridgeton, N. J.; H. D. Irwin, Minneapolis, Minn.; Andrew H. Kean, Bridgeport, Conn.; J. Mumford Keese, M.D., Syracuse, N. Y.; Arch H. Logan, M.D., Rochester, Minn.; J. Forbes McBurney, Seattle, Wash.; Matthew McCroddan, Bloomfield, N. J.; William McLaughlin, Philadelphia; Rolfe D. Marthens, Denver, Colo.; John R. Martin, Darby, Pa.; Alfred L. Munger, Concord, Calif.; George F. Norton, Philadelphia; William Orr, Pasadena, Calif.; Harry A. Palmer, Philadelphia; Arthur Patterson, Wilmington, Del.; James C. Phillips, Baltimore, Md.; James L. Rankin, Chester, Pa.; James B. Robertson, Malvern, Pa.; Edwin T. Ross, New York; T. Edward Ross, Ardmore, Pa.; James F. Shrader, Philadelphia; John L. Steele, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.; Paul Strong, Bellingham, Wash.; H. A. Worcester, Cincinnati, Ohio; Charles F. Wray, Rochester, N. Y.; Harry Wunderlich, Detroit, Mich.; William L. Yerkes, Philadelphia; Edwin A. Zeller, Jr., Philadelphia.]

Dr. Rimmer and the Flemington Meetings The Story Behind the Story

By the Rev. Charles E. Wideman

IN JULY, 1934, the writer and another young man felt the need of an intensive county-wide evangelistic awakening in Hunterdon County, New Jersey. We were told there had been no such concerted effort for thirty-five years. Flemington was chosen as the town because of its centrality and the First Methodist Church as the place of meeting because of its sincere willingness to be of assistance in the preaching of the Word of life. An interdenominational committee was formed consisting of thirty men and women prominent in the affairs of the county. This committee decided to invite DR. HARRY RIMMER, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Duluth, to be the evangelist.

At a regular meeting of the Hunterdon County Ministerial Association, the matter of the cooperation of the various churches in the county was discussed. The proposed plan seemed favorable to Dutch Reformed, Christian, Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian ministers alike who were members of the association. Twenty churches agreed to cooperate.

At a later meeting of the ministerial association the campaign was further discussed. The REV. SARGENT BUSH, pastor of the

Flemington Presbyterian Church, arose (the first time he had attended in years), and said that he was very sorry DR. RIMMER had been engaged, for he had criticized severely the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, "of which DR. ROBERT SPEER is the general secretary and DR. CHARLES ERDMAN is the president." This, of course, brought a general protest from the brethren of other denominations, who seemed to think this an injection of an extraneous matter of Presbyterian ecclesiastical polity, of which they knew nothing. "This is a Presbyterian fuss," objected one. They did not know concerning DR. RIMMER'S views on the mission question, but they did know of his reputation for courageously preaching the gospel to an unbelieving generation.

The news of DR. RIMMER'S engagement in Flemington soon reached members of the New Brunswick presbytery. They hastily decided to flay the proposed services and deplore the coming of DR. RIMMER. Dispatches were sent to the newspapers which stated that the grounds of objection lay in the unseasonable time the meetings were to be held, coinciding with the Hauptmann trial; and that outside influences were promoting the venture in order

to capitalize on the sensationalism of the Lindbergh kidnapping affair.

At the same meeting of presbytery, a resolution was formulated and sent to the Duluth presbytery, urging that body to dissuade DR. RIMMER from coming to Flemington. An extremely unusual request for one presbytery to make of another, it told them that the New Brunswick presbytery for more than one hundred years has been fully capable of taking care of the needs of people living within its bounds, and deplored the coming of a "roving" evangelist into its midst. Would they not urge DR. RIMMER to stay home?

The Duluth presbytery is to be commended because it took no action on this resolution. According to DR. RIMMER, the missive was offensive to the members of that body, which resented such high-handed tactics. A letter was sent to the New Jersey group, urging them to get behind the meetings and pray for them. DR. RIMMER sent a telegram to the evangelistic committee in charge of the promotion of the services which read: "Nothing will keep me from Flemington except your cancellation." Just what we expected. DR. RIMMER would kow-tow to no group by heeding such an absurd request.

The then governor of the state of New Jersey, A. HARRY MOORE, was living at the time in his summer home at Mt. Airy, a short distance from Flemington. When told of the proposed meetings he was glad and allowed the use of his name in securing DR. RIMMER. Because Hunterdon county had been so many times plagued with evangelism of a sensational type, the governor's approval brought assurance to many that the preaching would be sane.

When a well-known educator, head of a nearby Presbyterian Seminary, learned of DR. RIMMER'S coming and the governor's sanction, he is said to have called the executive chamber and in a conversation with the chief executive, painted the venture black. The burden of the protest, according to the governor, was that the meetings had too much connection with the trial of Haupt-

mann. The immediate effect was a telephone call from the governor to the pastor of the Methodist Church in Flemington, urging him to postpone the meetings until the Hauptmann trial was over. DR. BINDENBERGER, the pastor, said he would gladly concur, but before doing so, would like an interview with his excellency. This was granted.

When the governor learned through the lips of this Methodist minister, other angles which had not been before brought to his attention, his eyes were opened. "Go ahead with the meetings," he said. "As long as they have no connection with the Hauptmann trial, you have my blessing!" As a matter of interest to Bible-believing Christians, he further added: "Gentlemen, I believe the Bible from cover to cover, and have so taught it for many years in the Sunday-school."

A Presbyterian minister who stood opposed to us and one who "stands in" with the ecclesiastical machine, sarcastically asked why the governor's approval was sought. "Don't you know," he said, "that he is only a politician?" "Yes," was the retort, "but it is better to have the endorsement of a Christian politician, than the vigorous opposition of a church politician!" He had nothing more to say.

DR. RIMMER was with us from January the twentieth until February the third. He preached powerful messages on the harmony of science and Scripture. Many were comforted, others strengthened in the faith and we thank God some were saved eternally.

This recent occurrence, as well as many other notable ones in the Presbyterian Church, clearly reveal a great monster looming on the horizon of our religious life, threatening the constitutional liberty of every faithful dispenser of the Word of life. How long will genuine Presbyterians tolerate this gross oppression and tyranny? Let us mass our forces and fight to the last ditch! We are unalterably opposed to the sale of our constitutional birth-right for a mess of high-handed ecclesiastical pottage.

Letters to the Editor

[The letters printed here express the convictions of the writers, and publication in these columns does not necessarily imply either approval or disapproval on the part of the Editors. If correspondents do not wish their names printed, they will please so request, but all are asked kindly to sign their names as an evidence of good faith. We do not print letters that come to us anonymously.]

How Outsiders View the Machen Trial

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: There is an innate sense of justice in humanity that protests rather violently against high-handed injustice. Not for a generation has anything so high handed, so unjust, so utterly unchristian been witnessed, as the trial of Dr. Gresham Machen in the New Brunswick Presbytery. The "trial," as an outsider sees it, was a farce in every feature of it. It began, proceeded and ended on the *assumption* that the accused was guilty of conduct not only un-Presbyterian but unchristian, and that he was deliberately and purposely disrupting the Presbyterian Church. But the most intolerable thing about the trial was the evident eagerness and avidity with which it was inaugurated and carried on. Knowing full well that the Philadelphia Presbytery would never lend itself to such partisan-

ship as would be necessary to convict Dr. Machen of the slightest irregularity or any thing unchristian, the New Brunswick Presbytery claimed the right to *try* Dr. Machen, though to the public thought, since he was a member of the Philadelphia Presbytery, they not only had no *necessity* of trying the case, but as a matter of fact had no right other than by an utterly arbitrary ruling unjustified by any of the facts. This very eagerness to destroy the ecclesiastical standing of one of the most admired and venerated clergymen in the United States was in itself a clear indication that the element of justice would not even be considered by those who so eagerly constituted themselves a tribunal.

Worse yet was the elimination of every ground upon which Dr. Machen could establish the justice of his position.

To outside evangelicals, the case was altogether prejudged by the illegal action of the last General Assembly. How perfectly manifest was the fixed decision of the ec-

clesiastical court that proceeded to the trial was seen in practically every decision of the Moderator and the vote of men who "had it in for" Dr. Machen because he has steadily protested against the outrageously heretical position involved in The Auburn Affirmation. It requires no legally trained mind to see that an adoption of the *apostasy* inevitably involved in relegating to unimportance and insignificance the very heart of the gospel, namely, The Virgin Birth, the Atonement, and the Resurrection, as indicated in The Auburn Affirmation, leaves not merely an eviscerated and an emasculated gospel but *no gospel at all*. No wonder men, who sign such an affirmation seeing the handwriting on the wall, are seeking cover under a worked up sentiment in favor of their unbiblical and unchristian position.

Dr. Machen has not had even a semblance of a fair trial, in the estimation of tens of thousands of people. We are sure the great Presbyterian Church cannot afford to remain under the stigma that has been put upon it by rejecting young men for the ministry whose crime is faith in the Bible as the Word of God. When men like Dr. Machen and President Buswell are summoned to trial "there is something rotten in Denmark." It will be a sorry day for Presbyterianism if such a travesty as the

pretended trial of Dr. Machen is permitted to stand as the judgment of the majority. When a Congregational Church like the historic Park Street Church makes a special point of inviting both Dr. Machen and Dr. Buswell to occupy its pulpit, it is evident that the *gospel of the square deal* is not yet dead. Apparently nothing is so illiberal as Modernism. The right to organize in the interests of a Christian gospel and to designate where contributions should be made in the interests of the fulfillment of the *Great Commission* ought not even to be questioned.

A. Z. CONRAD,
Pastor of Park Street Church,
Boston, for thirty years.

Lest We Forget

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Some years ago the General Assembly made a pronouncement concerning the conduct of New York Presbytery in licensing men to the gospel ministry who refused to affirm their belief in cardinal doctrines of our Confession. The Assembly's pronouncement mentioned five articles of the faith as essential and necessary and sent down a reproof to the Presbytery. Immediately after the Assembly adjourned the very next Sunday, in fact, a pastor in a prominent Fifth Avenue pulpit stood up and declared, that the Assembly's pronouncement was "a yoke, which, he for one, did not intend to wear." His discourse continued to the effect that Assemblies were mercurial bodies swayed by demagogues. Assemblies had no authority anyway. All power is vested in the Presbytery. It is the *Presbytery* which must be satisfied regarding candidates for the ministry. Assemblies are merely conventions, popular mass meetings held for information and inspiration. An Assembly's edicts are merely advisory and, are likely to be revoked by the next Assembly.

That's the way the modernists talked about the General Assembly in 1925: nine years have elapsed, and now, the same modernists who blew cold, blow hot, in the face of the Assembly's pronouncement.

2. Reminiscence number two. When students under examination as candidates for admission to the sacred ministry were asked concerning their faith in essential doctrines of our Confession (our Constitution) they were accustomed to reply, "I neither affirm, nor deny."

This answer was always held by the modernists to be sufficient, and, if any fundamentalist brother attempted to press the candidate, or to move to defer his licensure until such time as the candidate could either 'affirm' or 'deny,' that fundamentalist brother was unceremoniously squelched. If a complaint was taken against the action of presbytery, after it had proceeded to licensure and ordination over the protest

of a minority, the modernists held that nothing could be done to the licentiate or newly ordained man in question. They held that he, by virtue of the act of presbytery, right or wrong, was now in *rectus ecclesia*, and therefore could not be attacked except on some de novo heretical utterance. A heresy trial was, therefore, the only recourse of the aggrieved minority in Presbytery.

When taken up to synod complaints against the action of Presbytery were manhandled, or rather the complaints were manhandled. And by the time a complaint against the action of Presbytery and the manhandling of synod finally reached the General Assembly the "offending candidate had been transferred to some other Presbytery or denomination, the Judicial commission of the General Assembly had been put wise, a powerful platform Commission had been appointed to "enlarge the scope of the inquiry" into the state of the whole church, and the original complainants had been pilloried in the ecclesiastical and public press as "trouble makers" who, "if they did not like the Presbyterian Church ought to get out."

There may be some brethren old enough to recall these days—the days of the "Fosdick Case" and "the Virgin Birth Case" in the assemblies of a near decade ago, and, *mutatis mutandis*, revive the tactics of the intellegentia of those days. When confronted with a decree of the General Assembly, let the accused cite the modernists or perhaps better, cite F. of G. Chapter I, paragraphs VII and VIII—"that all (church) councils may err, through the frailty inseparable from humanity"—and, when asked to take an oath or make a declaration concerning "loyalty to the Boards" or "obedience to the General Assembly's edict," knavely repeat the formula,—"I neither affirm nor deny."

Since when has a General Assembly been given the right to alter the constitutional questions to be asked of a candidate, or a minister transferring his membership from one Presbytery to another?

And, finally, when it comes to a Presbytery undertaking to enforce an unconstitutional pronouncement of an Assembly, and to excommunicate a layman, an elder, because the layman declines to recognize the right of the Assembly to pass such an unconstitutional rule, it is to laugh. The laymen are the church—the supporting constituency of the church. Pastors are in a different predicament. Pastors depend on the church, the church depends on the laymen. At any time a layman may take his hat and walk out and take his purse with him, and let Assemblies sit high and dry fulminating against the air. It is different in the case of the minister. He may be punished, brow-beaten, put out, deprived of his pulpit and his pension, but when a General Assembly, or a Presbytery becomes so

obsessed with the idea of its authority that it thinks it has such control over a layman or a layman's money (unless the layman is dead) that General Assembly, or, that Presbytery has one more think coming.

Let us ponder these reminiscences.

ALBERT DALE GANTZ.

NEW YORK

General Council in Error

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

SIR: In the Assembly minutes of 1934, page 80, an error appears in the interpretation of the General Council in a Study of the Constitution.

The Form of Government, Chapter XII, treats of the General Assembly. Section V of the Chapter states, "To the General Assembly also belongs the power of deciding in all controversies respecting doctrine and discipline; of reproving, warning, or bearing testimony against error in doctrine, or immorality in practice, in any church, Presbytery, or Synod; of superintending the concerns of the whole Church, of suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations; and in general, of recommending and attempting reformation of manners, and the promotion of charity, truth, and holiness, through all the churches under their care." Following this the General Council says, "The General Assembly, therefore, represents the whole Presbyterian Church. It has all the powers the Church would have if it were possible to convene the Church together in one place. . . . The *jurisdiction* of the Session is over the 'members of their own congregation'; of the Presbytery over Sessions and 'particular churches'; of the Synod over 'Presbyteries, Sessions, and people'; of the General Assembly over 'any church, Presbytery, or Synod.'"

The Council goes off on a tangent.

The Constitution gives the Assembly its right and prerogative under the Form of Government and not under the Book of Discipline. The province of the Assembly is *constructive* government and not *corrective discipline*. The Assembly is not a Court of Original Jurisdiction but is the highest court of interpretation and appeal. If the Assembly were a Court of Original Jurisdiction another court above would be required as a court of appeal from the decisions of the Assembly. The Council's opinion is that the government is like a Chinese nest of four boxes and that the Assembly is the last outside box. It is the rightness of the Assembly that brings obedience and not any power wrapped up in a Supreme Court.

The Presbyterian Church is not governed by the "mob" at either end of the line. The "mob" in the church is limited to the choice of who shall be elders to rule them, who shall be their pastor to teach them and the amount of support they will give their pastor.

The Commissioners to the Assembly go as proxies and have the right in the premises only as limited by the Constitution as quoted above. If the whole church could be convened in one place the "mob" would be referred to the constitutional limitations and would be treated as Coxy's army at Washington City, where they were told to get off the grass!

The Council's opinion would set up a whipping post in the Supreme Court. It would warrant parents to do their chastising in the parlor when company was present. The Assembly is self-contained and self-governed and has the right of administrative government, but the word "Jurisdiction" is misleading and without foundation.

The Assembly cannot order or mandamus any personal discipline. It cannot delegate a power that it does not itself possess. The minister can be disciplined only by his Presbytery or Synod with a right to appeal. The Presbyterian Church is under a constitution and a constitution is a covenant or contract that every person accepts that joins the church and if a promise was not given to obey the government admission to membership would be refused. The privilege of the mob law is checked at the very entrance and it is strange that any one acquainted with the Constitution would suggest that the Assembly might function as a mob.

A PRESBYTER.

Independent David vs. General Assembly Goliath

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Sir: Any minister or elder who gives devoted attention to the meetings of church session, presbytery, synod, or general assembly, is likely to feel elated over the way these successive church courts function. When these bodies are harmonious and aggressive in the work of the Lord, they seem to be swept by the Holy Spirit and the commissioners come away feeling "it was good to be there." The general spiritual atmosphere is usually pervaded with warmth and cordiality. Even fiery debates over questions of doctrine or church polity are usually considerate of the views of the other fellow, and, if acrimony breaks loose it is only in the heat of battle and is usually followed by Christianlike apology.

While the Presbyterian system of government is admirably conceived, democratic and statesmanlike in its breadth and scholarship, it should always be remembered that majority votes settle disputed questions, rather than the dictum of a bishop or a Pope, and that, while majorities are good in both civil and ecclesiastical law, they are not necessarily correct or final. A majority vote settles the current question for the time but not necessarily for all time. A resolution passed with a loud

chorus of ayes and with much enthusiasm may be a well considered move but it may also be the expression of a lot of hungry delegates who are tired and anxious for adjournment.

Thus, questions of profound significance are sometimes passed upon by a legislative body with little or no deliberative study if only they can be disposed of and a crowded docket curtailed. The conclave becomes like a steam roller and minorities are rolled flat and the "outs" are crushed by the "ins." Any representative body is apt to become a steam roller and our church courts are no exception.

The general assembly, to which Presbyterians look as the supreme court of our church, is just as apt to become a steam roller under stress as is the congress of the United States. Witness the action of general assembly toward a group of ministers and elders who have had the courage to organize an Independent Board for Foreign Missions. With a big majority vote these men were threatened by general assembly with disciplinary action unless they resign from said Independent Board. The rebels claim that their Board is in no way connected with the Presbyterian church and that there is no church law forbidding what they have done. You can't break a law that doesn't exist. These men also claim to be rock ribbed Presbyterians. Their response to the threat of excommunication

is to unanimously refuse to resign, and they have started several new missionaries toward the foreign field. Further, they say that if the general assembly desires to use the steam roller let the court get after the Auburn Affirmation group. If the general assembly can't get "all het up" over that group of disloyal presbyters it can hardly with consistency bawl out the Independents. One can't help the suspicion that the Affirmationists are too numerous and influential to be called to order without generating considerable friction in the general assembly machinery. Nevertheless, a clearing of the ecclesiastical atmosphere might be wholesome. We hear of men who signed the Auburn Affirmation but would like to unsign it. They went along with others, thinking little, and desiring to be "broad" in their views toward the great truths of Scripture. Since the general assembly goliath now seems to be defied by the little David Independents it might behoove the commissioners to the next assembly to give more thought to what the church believes, preaches, and stands for. This ought not to be difficult for a body of Presbyterians who were once described by a President of the U. S. as "standing with the stiffness of a steel beam for the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

ELI BENEDICT,
(Elder North Pres. Church, New York
Presbytery)

Sunday School Lessons for June (International Uniform Series)

By John Murray, M.A., Th.M.
Instructor in Systematic Theology, Westminster
Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

Lesson for June 2, 1935

OUR DAY OF WORSHIP

(Lesson Text—Psalm 100; John 4:20-24; Col. 3:15-17)

Too many professing Christians have little or no understanding of the real meaning of our day of worship, the Lord's day. Their thought is governed in the matter by considerations of custom, tradition, and utility, and so the distinction they draw between the Lord's day and other days of the week is at its best purely an accidental one. It is customary to make a distinction between the first day of the week and the other days, and they find it useful to conform to long-established tradition.

But what makes the difference between the first day of the week and the other six days is divine institution and command, and in the last analysis other considerations, though not in themselves inherently wrong, will never of themselves lead to a godly observance of the Christian Sabbath. Our day of worship rests upon the prin-

ciple enunciated at creation, reaffirmed in the Decalogue, and confirmed by the example and teaching of our Lord Himself. It is, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy" (Ex. 20:8)—a command of universal and perpetual obligation and application.

This principle must *cheerfully* be recognized. Frequently, Christians assent to it and try to obey the command, but with half-hearted and reluctant formalism. What a weariness it is, they say, that we have kept God's ordinance! They do not call God's day a delight. Such worship or obedience is never acceptable to God. "God is a Spirit, and they who worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth." (John 4:24.) "Serve the Lord with gladness: come before His presence with singing. . . . Enter into His gates with thanksgiving, and into His courts with praise: give thanks unto Him and bless His name." (Ps. 100:2, 4.)

It was John Calvin who said that pure and genuine religion "consists in faith, united with a serious fear of God, comprehending a voluntary reverence, and pro-

ducing legitimate worship agreeable to the injunctions of the law." (Inst. I, 2.2.) A more pregnant definition was never framed by mere man. Worship of God is the whole-souled response of man to God's revelation of Himself. Worship that does not flow in the channel of divine revelation and authorization, worship of human devising, is superstition and often idolatry. "Ye worship ye know not what," said Jesus to the woman of Samaria. (John 4:22.) Paul in like fashion insists that the worship of the Colossians is to be the fruit of the indwelling of the word of Christ. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God." (Col. 3:16.) The material of worship as well as the rule of worship is the Word of God.

There is a grand universalism about the worship of the one living and true God under the New Testament economy. It is as universal as the preaching of the gospel. The cross of Christ has broken down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile. He abolished in His flesh the enmity even the law of commandments contained in ordinances. Believers everywhere are called in one body. (Col. 3:15.) They have access by one Spirit into the Father. (Eph. 2:18.) It was this Jesus was contemplating when He said to the woman, "But the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him." (John 4:23.) It is the universalism dictated in Ps. 100, "Make a joyful noise unto the Lord *all ye lands.*"

Lesson for June 9, 1935

THE HOLY SPIRIT

Lesson Text — John 16:7-11; Rom. 8:10-17, 26, 27

The Holy Spirit is the third person of the Godhead. He is no less God than the Father is God and the Son is God, because He possesses in Himself the fullness of the Divine nature and essence common to all three persons. The intradivine personal distinction of the Holy Spirit is that He proceeds from the Father and the Son. The nature of this eternal procession is ineffable; on it we may not speculate. We must accept it as a fact, however, because otherwise we should deny His personal distinctness. The personal distinction of the Father is that He is of none, that of the Son that He is of the Father by generation, and that of the Holy Spirit that He is of the Father and Son by procession.

These are eternal and immanent distinctions; there are also economical distinctions. These economical distinctions express the different ways in which the persons of the Trinity are related to the creatures they

have created. In the scheme of redemption, these distinctions are particularly important. It is the Father who gave to the Son a people to be by Him redeemed; it was the Son who by incarnation and His atoning work redeemed them; it is the Holy Spirit's prerogative and work to apply to lost men the redemption purchased by Christ. It is this arrangement of divine wisdom and grace we must bear in mind in the interpretation of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit was truly present in the world and in believers before Pentecost. He was operative in the creation of the world and its continuous government. It was by His gracious operation that men were regenerated and sanctified in all generations. It was by His power that the Son was conceived in the womb of the Virgin. His presence was a constant reality in the life and work of Jesus upon the earth.

But there is also a special sense in which He came forth on Pentecost. God's self-revelation and redemptive plan entered upon a new and distinct era. The difference in revelation and operation is paralleled by the difference in the work of Christ Himself. In all generations, men were saved by the work of Christ. But before Christ came, men were saved by a prospective reference to what Christ was yet to accomplish. During the Old Testament dispensation this salvation was largely confined within the pale of God's chosen race. As we found in the preceding lesson, in the words of Jesus, salvation was of the Jews. On the accomplishment of Christ's work a mighty change was wrought in the unfolding of God's redemptive plan. Ethnical distinctions were abolished. The promise given to Abraham was fulfilled. "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." In accordance with this change, Christ was, as the God-man, exalted to mediatorial dominion over all things for the sake of His body the church.

It is precisely this series of facts that is the background of the sending and coming of the Holy Spirit spoken of in our first text. It is the Spirit's work to apply redemption. But since upon the accomplishment of redemption by Christ that redemption flows in infinite abundance to all nations and kindreds, so the operations of the Holy Spirit in order to the realization of God's purpose are correspondingly abundant in nature, mode, and extent. The revelation of the manifold purpose of God, of the mystery hid from ages and from generations, had entered so far as this world and age is concerned upon its final era: it was the distinct function of the Holy Spirit to demonstrate, authenticate, and, in the applicatory sense, realize that fact. In divine wisdom and grace all this was reserved for Him. So Jesus says, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Com-

forter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." (John 16:7.) And note the emphasis upon the consequences for the world and the disciples. The former is to be convicted of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. The latter are to be guided into all the truth, truth which Jesus in person did not, and because of their incapacity could not, teach them; truth which angels desired to look into and concerning which prophets sought and searched diligently.

Lesson for June 16, 1935

CHRISTIAN STEWARDSHIP

(Lesson Text—Deut. 8:11-18; II Cor. 9:6-8)

"Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights." (James 1:17.) In God we live, move, and have our being; our times are wholly in His hands; in one word we are completely dependent upon God. Not only are we dependent upon Him; we are also responsible to Him, responsible to Him not in some things but in every department and detail of life. It is upon these broad principles of dependence and responsibility that the more specific duty of Christian Stewardship rests.

The believer is in a peculiar sense God's possession. He has been bought, with a price; he is not his own and he has nothing but that which he has received.

The highest privilege those who have been redeemed by the grace of God enjoy is that of sonship; they constitute by divine adoption the family of God. In this the highest sphere of their relations to God and to His family they have communion with one another, affectionate care for one another's highest interests, fellowship in plenty and want, in riches and poverty. It is of this particular privilege and duty that the Apostle is reminding the Corinthians, the grace of Christian liberality. "But as ye abound in everything, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this grace also." (II Cor. 8:7.) He commends to them the example of the churches of Macedonia in whose case "the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality." (Vs. 2.)

Christian liberality not only blesses the partaker of the blessing, but also the bestower of it. It is a law of the Kingdom of God as well as in nature. "He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly: and he that soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully." (II Cor. 9:6.) "The liberal soul shall be made fat; and he that watereth shall be watered also himself." (Prov. 11:25. Cf. also Vs. 24.) God makes grace to abound to those who abound in grace, so that having all sufficiency in all things, they

abound all the more in every good work. (Cf. II Cor. 9: 8.)

The implications of the word *liberality* must fully be appreciated; it involves a principle constantly to be remembered. Giving is not a tax; it is a free-will offering. To speak of an extorted gift is self-contradiction. Voluntariness and cheerfulness are of the essence of liberality. "Let each man give as he hath purposed in his heart; not grudgingly or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver." (Vs. 7.) It might be sometimes supposed that this emphasis is calculated to undermine the foundations of the ecclesiastical benevolence system. The truth is that the church treasury which is built on another emphasis needs to be undermined. It is woefully unchristian. Extortion in the name of Christianity has sometimes given us vast superstructures of ecclesiastical organization, but they have brought with them superstition and tyranny. The springs of Christian liberality must run freely if they are to run at all. They have their source in the free grace of God, grace that has found its supreme expression in the self-sacrifice of the Son of God. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be made rich." (II Cor. 8: 9.) The mind, imbued with a sense of indebtedness to the abounding grace of God, must in gratitude abound in grace. It is the Lord who brings forth water out of the rock of flint and feeds His people with manna from heaven. "But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God, for it is He that giveth thee power to get wealth; that He may establish His covenant which He swore unto thy fathers, as at this day." (Deut. 8: 18.)

Lesson for June 23, 1935

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS

(Lesson Text—Acts 1:6-8; 13:1-12)

The *basis* for Christian missions is the fact that men by nature are lost and perishing in sin. Apart from the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ they are irretrievably lost. There is only one name given under heaven among men whereby they can be saved, the name of Jesus. Much of the missionary enterprise of today is conducted on a different basis. Such missionary work is not Christian, however plausible it may appear. It may contribute to educational advancement and social uplift but social betterment is not salvation.

The *motive* of Christian missions is love to God and to our fellow men. Such love is grounded in a knowledge of the truth. True love never obliterates or submerges facts. It may seem harsh to avow that the sincere devotees of pagan religion are lost, but to disavow it is a denial of the gospel. It is the purest love to proclaim it.

The *end* of Christian missions is the

glory of God and the salvation of men; the *directing principle* is obedience to our Lord's command, "Go ye therefore and disciple all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Matt. 28: 19.), the impetus to the fulfillment of which is derived from the consideration of Christ's universal dominion and lordship.

God is pleased to use men as the instruments in the proclamation of the gospel; but the destinies of His redemptive purpose are not left in the hands of men. It is the Holy Spirit who directs and controls real missionary work. The Holy Spirit it was who said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." (Acts 13: 2.) True missionaries are called and sent forth by the Holy Spirit. (Cf. Vs. 4.) He is the energizing power by which the task is fulfilled. (Acts 1: 8.) In the last analysis, it is not the pure motives and lofty aims that enable men to endure the hardship and temptation of what often seems a fruitless and thankless undertaking, but the Holy Spirit Himself who endues His servants with these motives and purposes.

The Holy Spirit uses instrumentalities ordained by Him. This principle is eloquently stressed in Acts 13: 2, 3. In sending forth men, He uses the institution of the church. Note four things carefully: the *ministry* of the church, *fasting* by the church, the Spirit's *command* to the church, and the corresponding *actions* of the church. The Spirit separated and called and sent forth Barnabas and Saul, but He commanded the church to separate and send forth also. These are not exclusive; they are mutually complementary. The calling of the Spirit is realized through, and authenticated by, the commission on the part of the church. Would that this were written upon our hearts as with a pen of iron! The church is the organ God has established for the execution of missionary enterprises.

The main task of the missionary is to preach the word. "Ye shall be my witnesses," said Jesus, "both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 1: 8.) "And when they were at Salamis, they proclaimed the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews." (Acts 13: 5.) They preach the word for one manifest reason—it is the power of God unto salvation.

Lesson for June 30, 1935

LIBERTY UNDER LAW

(Lesson Text—Rom. 14:13-21; I Cor. 8:9-13)

It has always been the work of the prince of darkness to obliterate the line of distinction between truth and error, right and wrong, good and evil. It is a sin to judge to be right what God has revealed to be wrong. It is likewise a sin to judge to be

wrong what God has sanctioned as right. "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil." These two kinds of false judgment invariably go together. The inviolable distinction between right and wrong lies at the basis of true liberty. Christian liberty is always within the sphere of right, never within the sphere of wrong. A man is only at liberty to be and to do what it is right to be and to do. This is just to say the apparent, that it is never right to be or to do wrong.

The lesson texts have been greatly abused both in the direction of license and tyranny. The libertine has used them to justify his wrong, and the fanatic to justify the invasion upon right.

The question in both is that of the relation of the believer to the partaking of certain meats and drinks, clearly, in I Cor. 8, the eating of meat offered to idols. More specifically, it is the question of the conduct of the strong and intelligent believer. May he eat meat that has been offered by another to an idol?

Paul contends for the liberty of such a person. "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean of itself." (Rom. 14: 14.) The believer strong in faith and knowledge knows that an idol is nothing in the world, that there is no other God but one, that the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, and so meat is not contaminated or made in itself sinful by the mere fact that an idolater offered it to an idol. The idolater truly sinned, but the meat did not become sinful. The intelligent believer may freely eat and give the Lord thanks. It is his *liberty* , Paul says, so to do. (I Cor. 8: 9.)

This liberty in the honorable use of things in themselves not sinful Paul jealously guards. He was inspired by the Spirit thus to write, and the honor of God and of His word demands our recognition of it. Any infringement upon this inviolable right is an offense to the glory of God.

But Paul not only guards the right of the strong; he also considers the edification of the weak. With appealing tenderness, he enjoins upon his readers a like solicitude for the good of others. "But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to the weak." (I Cor. 8: 9.) "But judge ye this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock in his brother's way, or an occasion of falling." (Rom. 14: 13.) There are believers, true believers indeed, who are still weak in faith and knowledge, and because of past defilement in idolatrous worship would in partaking of meat sacrificed to idols eat it as of a thing sacrificed to an idol. In this way they would defile their conscience by the guilt of an act of idolatrous worship. The believer, however, who has no such weakness of conscience may without any such defilement, so far as he himself is concerned, freely eat. Nevertheless, he, because controlled by love and

the desire to build up rather than destroy, will consider the edification of his weaker brother. Lest his partaking should be an inducement or emboldenment to the weak brother to do what by reason of his weakness he is not yet able to do, he—the strong believer—will abstain. But let it be distinctly observed that the reason is the weakness of the other, not at all his own conscience. All things are *lawful* for him, but not all things not expedient; all things are *lawful* for him, but not all things edify. (Cf. I Cor. 10: 23.) In these circumstances edification dictates abstinence. Change the circumstances and edification might dictate no such thing. There is no law of expediency in such matters. "If meat causeth my brother to stumble," Paul says, "I will eat no flesh for evermore." Paul truly enjoins his own example upon us, but mark it—his abstinence rests upon a particular condition. It is, "If meat causeth my brother to stumble," to stumble in the sin of idolatry.

It is precisely here that untold perversion of Scripture enters. The exhortation of the Apostle has been applied to cases basically different from the particular case the Apostle has in mind, and it has been appealed to as the ground for legislation. This is to handle the word of God deceitfully and to pervert Scripture unto our own destruction. The honest and the true must do neither.

The Comfort of the Scriptures

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"But this I say, brethren, the time is short:" (1 Cor. 7: 29).

HOW quickly things happen in this world! It is a transient world. Nothing abides. "The fashion of this world passeth away."

The time we spend here is but a short half hour. The loveliest faces depart from us and the finest garments rot and decay. He who leans hard upon the things of this world is doomed to bitter disappointment.

The children of God should sit loose to everything here. This is the mind of the Apostle.

A believer stands on a watch tower—things present are below his feet—things eternal are before his view. A saint of God once said, "Build your nest upon no tree here; for you see God hath sold the forest to Death, and every tree whereon we would rest is ready to be cut down, to the end we may flee and mount up, and build upon the Rock, and dwell in the holes of the Rock."

There is One only whom we can prize. Every flower of this world will fade but the Rose of Sharon and the Lily of the Valley will never change. When all is taken we can still lean on Christ.

It is natural to mourn. Christ would not

stop our tears for He Himself wept. But through faith in Him we know this world *only* is a vale of tears. Those who believe view with the eyes of faith the portals of paradise. They do not complain. The promise is that Christ will bear us in His arms.

When we get to the presence of Jesus, all our griefs will look like children's griefs: a day in His presence will wipe every remembrance of this vale of tears away.

Therefore, "let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith."

The time is short. Even though there is much in this world given us to enjoy by a loving and gracious Father in heaven, we are not to abuse it. The child of God should "rejoice as though he rejoiced not." We cannot be much given to the joys that are here. The really good things are above where "Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." The table of real delights are already spread for us. The children of God should not dull their appetites with earthly joys. It ill becomes us to be much taken with

earthly banquets and dress when we are so soon to see the face of Jesus. The time is short.

Whatever our occupations, we should be prepared to leave them. We are but stewards of the grace of God. We must hold on to nothing but use all for God. If we were on a sinking ship, we would not cling hard to bags of money—we would sit loose to all, and be ready to swim. This world is like a sinking ship, and those who grasp at its possessions will sink with it.

Why does God give us time in which to live? It is to hear the gospel—to pray—and to be saved. But what precious moments we have lost, when we let go by opportunities for prayer and hearing God speak to us in His Word! The time is short. Shall the few days to come be as the moments that have passed? May God help us.

Throughout the never-ending ages of eternity, we will remember the few days we spent here. How will we remember them?

Be wise brethren. Stand not all the day idle. The time is short.

News of the Church

Westminster Seminary Commencement

THE sixth annual commencement exercises of Westminster Theological Seminary were held on Tuesday, May 7, 1935, at 8 P. M., in the Witherspoon Auditorium, Philadelphia. The exercises, presided over with dignity and felicity by the Rev. Charles Schall, D.D., of Wayne, Pennsylvania (Moderator of the Presbytery of Chester), began with the singing of the hymn, "Jesus Shall Reign Where'er the Sun," followed by the Long Meter Doxology. The invocation was offered by the Rev. Warren R. Ward, D.D., Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. The great throng then rose and sang, "Ye Servants of God Your Master Proclaim." Present was the largest and most enthusiastic crowd of persons ever to attend a Westminster commencement.

Scripture was read by the Rev. Robert Scott Inglis, D.D., of Newark, New Jersey, and prayer was offered by the Rev. Charles F. Van Horn, Jr., Moderator of the Presbytery of Monmouth. The address of the evening was a brilliant and scholarly exposition of "The Greater Confession" of our Lord concerning Himself as found in Matthew 26: 64. It was delivered by the Rev. William Childs Robinson, Th.D., D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Church Polity, and Missions in Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia.

Following the address, the certificate of the Seminary was awarded to twenty-eight members of the senior class. The graduate certificate was awarded to four graduate students.

Prizes were announced as follows: The Frank H. Stevenson Fellowship, to Mr. E. Joseph Young; The William Brenton Greene, Jr., Prize in Apologetics, to Mr. E. Joseph Young; The William Brenton Greene, Jr., Prize in Systematic Theology, to Mr. John H. Rubingh; the Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield Prize in Old Testament, to Mr. Robert L. Atwell; The Robert Dick Wilson Prize in New Testament, to Mr. Jacob DeVries; The Richard H. Wallace Prize in Homiletics, to Mr. Walter J. Magee.

The address to the graduating class was of a peculiarly moving and earnest character. It was given by the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., Professor of New Testament. He gave as his message to the students a short meditation upon I Corinthians 16: 13, 14. They were to watch, to stand fast in the faith, to quit themselves like men, to be strong, *just because* they were to do all things in love. To do these things was necessary to fulfill one's love to God and man. And it all must be done in the grace and strength of God in Christ, not in our own weakness.

Following closing remarks by Dr. Schall, the great hymn, "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross," was lifted up in mighty volume, followed by the Benediction.

Ecclesiastical Situation Tense As Assembly Approaches

IN MID-MAY, the ecclesiastical situation in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. seemed to grow more tense as it became increasingly evident that the forthcoming General Assembly would witness a pitched

battle between those who favor and those who oppose the reversal of the action of the last Assembly relative to the Independent Board—a battle in which the lines will be drawn not between those who approve and those who disapprove of the Independent Board, but between those who approve and those who disapprove of the action of the last Assembly relative to the members and supporters of that Board who are members of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Important facts, in brief:

Overtures

Fourteen presbyteries had overtured the Assembly concerning foreign missions. Five of these presbyteries asked for investigations or safeguards of the work of the official Board: Bismarck, Duluth, Northumberland, West Jersey and Northern Arizona. Ten Presbyteries had suggested that the action of the last Assembly be rescinded, or that process be dropped against the members of the Independent Board: Northumberland, Galena, Northern Arizona, Denver, Philadelphia North, Portland, Waukon, Chippewa, George, and Hudson. Only presbytery giving whole-souled encouragement to things as they are was Niobrara which expressed itself as not favoring reversal of action of the 1934 Assembly. It was rumored that the Presbytery of New York had reported that it could find no instructions in the Book of Discipline telling it how to proceed in such a case as the present, but the terms of action were kept secret even from the person most affected, J. E. Bennet, Esq., Independent Board member of New York.

Moderatorship

Five candidates for the Moderatorship have appeared upon the horizon: Dr. C. W. Welsh, of Louisville, Kentucky; Dr. Ezra Allen Van Nuys, of San Francisco; Dr. A. E. Magary, Auburn Affirmationist of Brooklyn; Dr. Joseph A. Vance, President of the Board of National Missions, of Detroit; and Dr. Stewart M. Robinson, of Elizabeth, New Jersey, Editor of *The Presbyterian*. Dr. Robinson is the only one of these candidates openly to condemn the action of the last Assembly relative to the Independent Board as prejudiced and unwise and to urge that the next Assembly rescind that action. At the present writing it looks as though he would be the candidate of those who, whether they think the new Board itself wise or unwise, hold that the action of the last Assembly relative to that Board was ill-advised. Chief spokesmen for this point of view in published articles were Dr. Burleigh Cruikshank, of Philadelphia, and Dr. David De Forest Burrell, of Williamsport, Pennsylvania. The strength of this party was undetermined, but it seemed confident.

Mr. McIntire Brought to Trial

Only trial actually begun was that of the Rev. Carl McIntire, of Collingswood, New

Jersey. In April, the Presbytery of West Jersey, under severe hammering by the official Board of Foreign Missions, reconsidered and by a close vote rescinded its overture to the Assembly concerning the Board. A large delegation from the Board was present to exert oratorical and psychological pressure in the Presbytery. Little time was given Mr. McIntire to debate the reconsideration, none at all when the motion was made to rescind. The committee from the Board took approximately two hours. Following the meeting Mr. McIntire filed a complaint against the rescinding, signed by more than one-third of those present, designed to effect a stay.

Subsequently, also by a close vote and overriding the stay secured by Mr. McIntire's complaint earlier in the year, the Presbytery voted to try him by Commission. The Commission was elected and cited Mr. McIntire to appear before it on May 16th, at 10 A. M., in Atlantic City's First Church to receive the charges. Atlantic City is at the other end of the Presbytery from Mr. McIntire's Collingswood congregation.

Counsel for Mr. McIntire were announced as follows: the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, the Rev. A. L. Lathem, D.D., pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church of Chester, Pennsylvania, the Rev. H. S. Laird, D.D., pastor of the First and Central Church of Wilmington, Delaware, and Ruling Elder W. A. Chamberlin, of Collingswood.

The Prosecuting Committee was headed by the Rev. E. Lansing Bennet, of Merchantville, New Jersey.

Philadelphia North in Parliamentary Tangle

The Presbytery of Philadelphia North had before it, on May 7th, a notice of reconsideration of the overture adopted to the Assembly asking that the action against the Independent Board be rescinded. The Presbytery finally voted to reconsider; most of both parties voting for the motion, conservatives not to kill the overture but

to amend it. Then the Presbytery became caught in a parliamentary tangle from which it has not, apparently, emerged. According to accounts of those present (some of which differ), the motion to rescind, only motion then in order, in view of the notice of reconsideration, was never put or voted upon. Instead of this, two "amendments" were offered: First asking the Assembly to direct that all prosecutions cease; second, that all prosecutions be ordered stopped until the final decision of the Machen case. The second amendment was carried. The Moderator ruled that two votes would be needed—one on the amendment as amended; one on the main motion (the overture). The decision of the Moderator was appealed from, and he was not sustained. The Presbytery took no more votes on the motion. Result of the tangle seemed to be either that the overture formerly adopted, reconsidered but not rescinded, was still the action of Presbytery, or, at the most, that it had had the first amendment added to it. To render the situation still more complex, a complaint to the Synod, designed to stay the overture, had been filed against it, in its original form, by the persons who later amended it.

Independent Board Appointees Ordained

Two appointees of the Independent Board were ordained in their presbyteries on May 6th and 13th. The Presbytery of Philadelphia, on May 6th, ordained Mr. Alonzo Hitchcock, and the Presbytery of Philadelphia North voted to ordain Mr. Egbert W. Andrews, by a vote reported to be forty to thirty-five. In Philadelphia Presbytery there were no dissenting votes although it was a matter of public knowledge that Mr. Hitchcock was under Independent Board appointment. Mr. Andrews in his examination frankly informed the Presbytery of his intention to go out under the Independent Board. The vote to ordain him only followed a long hard fight.

Independent Board Meets, Seven Missionaries Appointed

Three New Members Elected

THE regular spring meeting of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions was held on April 30th, in the Drake Hotel, Philadelphia. Important actions:

Appointment of seven new missionaries. Five of these were young people, two were veteran distinguished missionaries newly resigned from the force of the official Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The latter were Dr. and Mrs. A. B. Dodd, of the North China

Theological Seminary, Tenghsien, Shantung Province, China. After long and futile protests against policies of the official Board in co-operating with nonevangelical projects in China, Dr. Dodd sent that Board his unconditional resignation. In making his decision, Dr. Dodd declared, "I wish you would state plainly that I have at last reached the point where I can no longer recommend the official Board to Bible-believing givers as a safe channel for their foreign mission gifts or continuance of contributions to them as the best way of supporting the hundreds of loyal mission-

aries in its service." The plans of **Dr. and Mrs. Dodd** for the immediate future are not yet known. They have accepted the appointment of the Independent Board.

The five other missionaries whose appointments were announced were: **Mr. and Mrs. Richard B. Gaffin**, who with their infant daughter will serve in China; **Mr. Alonzo Hitchcock** and his fiancée, **Miss Bessie Light**, who will go to Peru; and **Mr. Egbert W. Andrews**, who will serve in China. Messrs. **Gaffin, Hitchcock** and **Andrews** are graduates of Westminster Seminary, 1935. **Miss Light** will soon graduate from the Philadelphia School of the Bible.

New Board Members Elected

Three new members were elected to the Board: the **Rev. Milo F. Jamison**, of Los Angeles, **Ruling Elder W. R. Sibley** of the First Presbyterian Church of Seattle, Washington, and **Mr. Raymond T. Crane**, of Orange, New Jersey, a member of the Reformed Church in America.

New England Fellowship Offers Award

FOR the fourth consecutive year, the New England Fellowship is offering an award for distinguished service to a New England pastor and his wife. Pastors of all evangelical denominations are eligible to receive the award, providing they are not receiving a salary of more than \$2,000 a year. The decision as to the winner rests with a special committee of laymen and pastors of several denominations, and will be based on his influence on the spiritual life of the community, his devotion and sacrifice in carrying on his work, as well as his fidelity to the gospel message. Application may be made by the pastor himself or by any friend or observer of his work.

Three years ago the winners went on a two weeks' vacation trip to New York and Atlantic City. Two years ago the trip was to the Century of Progress at Chicago. Last year a tour of the mountain and shore resorts of New England was the prize. This year the winner and his wife will be the guests of leading mountain and seashore hotels of New England on a two weeks' trip.

Application must be filed before June 1st with the Committee on Pastors Award, New England Fellowship, 5 Park Street, Boston. No application blanks are furnished. A simple, concise statement of the case is all that is required.

New York and New England

By the Rev. L. Craig Long

THE Moody Bible Institute of Chicago held a Bible Conference in the Bedford Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, New York, during the week of May 5th. A simi-

lar conference was held in the Calvary Baptist Church of New York City.

The Spencer Memorial Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn is conducting what is called, "Dr. James Hardin Smith's Spiritual Recovery Crusade."

The special offerings on Easter Sunday in the South Presbyterian Church of Syracuse, New York, amounted to several thousand dollars. Nineteen new members were received into the church at that same time. **Dr. John T. Reeve**, the pastor of the church, has announced that plans are being made for another session of the Summer Bible School, beginning in June.

The **Rev. Chas. D. Chrissman**, formerly an instructor at Lincoln University in the Presbytery of Chester, has accepted the call extended to him by the Germonds Presbyterian Church of New York City, New York, and was installed by the Presbytery of Hudson on May 16th. The Sermon was delivered by **Dr. J. Gresham Machen**; the Charge to the congregation was preached by the **Rev. J. H. Thompson** of Montgomery, New York; the Constitutional Questions were propounded by the Moderator of Presbytery, the **Rev. Chas. F. Robson**; the Charge to the Pastor was delivered by the **Rev. L. Craig Long** of New Haven, Connecticut (a classmate of **Mr. Chrissman's** at Princeton, Class of 1929), while the Installation Prayer was offered by another classmate, the **Rev. Peter Wall** of Chester, New York.

The **Rev. John McComb** opened his ministry in the Broadway Presbyterian Church of New York City on Sunday, May 5th. This new pastorate has all of the promises of God's blessing because it is founded upon God's Word.

Mr. McComb was received by the Presbytery of New York on May 16th, after repeated plans to block his entrance to the Presbytery as "not loyal" to the Boards had fizzled out.

A free pamphlet entitled, "A Completely God-Paid Ministry in New Haven, Conn.," is ready for distribution. This report of the way a minister of a Presbyterian church has received his income on a completely faith basis has been much in demand and is now in its second printing. Copies may be secured by writing P. O. Box 1000, New Haven, Connecticut.

Announcement has been received of the marriage, on April 24th, of the **Rev. Wm. Harrillee Bordeaux** and **Miss Aghavni Hagopian**, in the First Presbyterian Church of Siloam Springs, Arkansas, where **Mr. Bordeaux** is now pastor at John Brown University. New Englanders remember him as the former pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Old Greenwich, Connecticut. He is a graduate of Westminster Theological Seminary.

The Independent Calvin Presbyterian Church of New Haven has received numerous requests, from exactly twenty-three States in the United States, asking for

details of the organization of independent Presbyterian churches. Through the courtesy of a Presbyterian Elder, copies of the charter of the church, as incorporated under the laws of Connecticut, are now available for free distribution to those who write for copies to P. O. Box 1000, New Haven, Connecticut.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Eastern Pennsylvania Letter

By the Rev. John B. Thwing, Th.D.

THE Westminster Seminary commencement on May 7th was one of the outstanding events of the month. **Prof. William Childs Robinson, Th.D., D.D.**, a columnist of CHRISTIANITY TODAY and a fellow club member of the writer of this column in the old Princeton days, was the speaker.

Comments upon the proposal to combine the Board of Christian Education, least modernistic of the boards, with that of National Missions, has raised the question in some minds whether it may be aimed at **Dr. W. C. Covert's** recently elected successor, **Dr. Harold McAfee Robinson**, who is regarded as conservative. If so, this is in line with the consistent efforts of Modernism to oust from office or pastorate any who oppose inclusivism. In any case, it will result in greater centralization of power, and thus fuller play for human frailty and political abuses of office. True Protestants detest papacy under any name, but Presbyterianism is on the high road to it.

Dr. Robert B. Whyte, Auburn Affirmationist co-pastor of the First Church, Philadelphia, and hero of a recent debate on companionate marriage, has accepted the call of the Old Stone Church of Cleveland. The *Public Ledger* says, "Special interest will center in **Dr. Whyte's** direction of the marriage guidance bureau" of the church.

Dr. Edmund G. Rawson, pastor of the Ardmore Church, died March 10th, aged sixty-six. He was a graduate of Princeton University and Auburn Seminary, and had served his present charge for twenty-seven years. He was a member of the Board of National Missions.

Commissioners to Synod from Philadelphia Presbytery are: Ministers: **I. Sturger Shultz**, **William P. Fulton**, **Edward Freeman**, **J. Norris McDowell**, **George A. Avery**, **H. Alford Boggs**, and **Weaver K. Eubank**; and Elders: **Albert B. Shaw** of Patterson Memorial Church; **Josiah W. Richman** of Northminster; **Roland M. Eavenson** of St. Paul; **Andrew P. Haig** of Hope; **Schuyler Armstrong** of Bethlehem; **Lawton V. Albright** of Richardson Memorial; and **Charles W. Bolton** of North-Mutchmore.

Elders **Vincent T. Shipley** of Tabernacle Church and **Gordon Clark** of Bethel, alternates to the General Assembly, will replace Elders **McLaughlin** and **Sutherland**.

Presbytery on motion of the **Rev. J. A.**

MacCallum, D.D., an Auburn Affirmationist, voted not to include on the docket a proposed reconsideration of all actions relating to heresy charges against signers of the Affirmation. The reconsideration was proposed by the Rev. Prof. Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D. "Liberal" members of Presbytery were out in force to vote for themselves, and during most of the meeting held a slight majority.

Three seniors in Westminster Seminary, Alonzo Hitchcock, Paul D. Wells, and Luther Fincke, were ordained on May 6th by Philadelphia Presbytery. Mr. Fincke, who was licensed at the same meeting, was dismissed to Utica Presbytery, and Mr. Hitchcock will go to South America as a missionary under the Independent Board. The Revs. Charles A. Stevens and C. S. McKensie were also dismissed to other presbyteries. An adjourned meeting was set for May 16th at 1:30 o'clock, to take up the mass of unfinished business.

PHILADELPHIA

Delaware-Maryland Letter

By the Rev. Henry G. Welbon

THE Presbytery of New Castle met April 22nd and 23rd in the Westminster Church, Wilmington, the Rev. John W. Christie, D.D., pastor. Following the custom of some of our higher judicatories, the meeting was begun with a spiritual note, by way of a communion service, as a prelude to a piece of distasteful legislation.

When, in reading the minutes of the previous meeting, the stated clerk came to the place where the new rules had been adopted, Dr. Christie got the floor on a point of order and proceeded to read a complaint to Synod which he threatened to make if these rules were not rescinded. The sections objected to were the article which required those entering the Presbytery to sign a doctrinal statement and the elimination of the council. The Moderator, the Rev. Thomas A. Williams of Wicomico Church, Salisbury, Maryland, ruled in favor of Dr. Christie. The vote on the appeal from the decision of the chair was said to be thirty to twenty-five sustaining the chair; many considered it was just the other way around. After this final piece of high-handed legislation the Moderator turned over his office to the newly elected Moderator, the Rev. Sidney J. Venable, D.D., pastor of the church in Pocomoke City, Maryland. He, in customary good spirit, appointed his opponent, the Rev. Clyde E. Rickabaugh, pastor of the White Clay Creek Church, near Newark, Delaware, Vice-Moderator. It was amusing, if it had not been so serious, to see those who had labored so hard to convince Presbytery that our rules were antiquated and needed prompt revising, now were most eager to go back to the old rules.

The Rev. George A. Burslem, pastor of

the Dover Church, asked that his relationship with it be dissolved to take effect September 1st. The Rev. Winfield S. Kreger, Ph.D., pastor of the historic Snow Hill Church in Maryland, asked that the relationship which he has held with that church for twenty-one years be dissolved to take effect April 30th. These requests were granted. The Rev. Franklin W. Stevens, who has been in ill health for the past several months, resigned as pastor of the Delaware City Church, but Presbytery decided to postpone action in the hope of Mr. Stevens's speedy recovery.

Presbytery voted against the overture from the Presbytery of Cayuga, and voted to concur with the Synod of Arizona in regard to investigating the literature sent out by the Board of National Missions.

Mr. John Jackson Brown, Jr., a licentiate in the Southern Presbyterian Church, graduate of Biblical Seminary and post-graduate student at Princeton Seminary, was called to the church in Milford, Delaware. He was examined with Raymond P. Sharp and C. Herman Bailey, students at Princeton Seminary, and Robert L. Harris of Westminster Seminary. All of them readily assented to supporting the benevolent agencies of the church, except Mr. Harris, who qualified his answer by saying "so long as they remained true to the Bible and constitution."

After the report from the Committee on Foreign Missions was read, the Rev. John P. Clelland, pastor of Eastlake Church, Wilmington, read certain recommendations which were in substance the West Jersey overture on Foreign Missions. A motion to table the matter was lost twenty-four to twenty-two. A motion to have it referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures was also defeated, but the time set for adjournment having arrived, nothing further was done. For the same reason, the Judicial Committee appointed to report on Dr. Laird's membership with the Independent Board was not heard.

NEWARK, DEL.

News Letter from Western Pennsylvania

By the Rev. H. J. Ockenga

THE great number of automobile fatalities is brought home to us when someone dear to us is suddenly snuffed out by the carelessness of some driver. Such was the case recently when Mr. John A. Bell, for fifty years organist in the First Presbyterian Church, was killed. The car in which he and Mrs. Bell and two friends were riding was struck and turned over on the Lincoln Highway. Three of the four died from injuries received. Great is the loss to Pittsburgh and to evangelical Christianity in the passing of these servants of the Lord. Mr. Bell was a director in

Westminster Theological Seminary as well as elder in the First Church. Mrs. Bell was vice-president and president alternately of the Pittsburgh Presbyterial since 1907.

The Easter services in most churches were thronged this year. Several churches reported the largest attendance in their history. This is most gratifying and may be significant of a new temper of the public mind. A Bible conference was held in the Third Presbyterian Church from April 7th to April 14th by Dr. William Evans, the father of the pastor. Dr. Evans is well known in many countries as a Bible expositor and has published twenty-six volumes. Young Dr. Evans spoke at the Easter sunrise service, which was attended by over seven thousand young people.

The Progressive Education Association met in Pittsburgh on April 12th and 13th. Included in the program was a meeting devoted to religious education and presided over by the modernist Bernard C. Clausen. Mrs. Margaret Bro, well-known author of several recent controversial articles in the *Christian Century*, was the main speaker. In the course of her remarks, she openly scoffed at the conception of Sin, the Trinity, the Virgin Birth, and the Resurrection as of no value to the church today. That the greater part of the audience was with her was evident from the laughter. During the following discussion one minister said, "If I attempted to put Mrs. Bro's suggestions into operation in my church I would have about four weeks to pick up the pieces and one week to pack my trunk. . . . But I haven't been here long. After a bit it will be different." His implication was that after he had apostatized his congregation by heretical teaching such things would be acceptable. If the Sunday School follows the lines laid down by these speakers, it will have outlived its usefulness to the Christian religion.

A Community Forum is held irregularly in the Carnegie Music Hall on Monday evenings. Recently, Bishop Francis McConnell was heard on the subject, "Free Speech in Pittsburgh." The following week, Dr. R. M. Hutchins, president of Chicago University, was heard. Both speakers were obviously brought to combat recent tendencies in Pittsburgh. First, Dr. Turner was turned out of the university for his anti-religious teachings. He was making his classroom a place of propaganda so that the parents of students objected to the effects his risqué stories and bold statements were having. Chancellor John Bowman rightly dismissed him. The occasion was taken by many radicals roundly to condemn the university for a policy of persecution, allegedly that Dr. Turner was fired because of his activities for social legislation outside the university. Their attempt culminated in a movement to cut off state appropriations. If such a result were effected, the University of Pennsylvania and Temple University would enter the controversy because western Pennsylvanians will not see tax money going

East and not here. The charge, however, is being proved to be groundless. The second item was the action of **Dr. B. Graham**, Superintendent of Schools, to close the auditoriums to Communist meetings. These have been agitation centers and some action was needful. It is one thing to have free speech, it is another to agitate against the basic principles of our government. In spite of the sentiment of the pink brethren brought here to raise sentiment against **Dr. Graham** and **Dr. Bowman**, these men are to be congratulated.

The Banner is published in Pittsburgh under the editorship of **Dr. James Snowden**. We regret to see this publication degenerate to the practice of name-calling. **Dr. Snowden** has called **Harry Rimmer**, **Carl McIntyre**, and **J. Gresham Machen** falsifiers, or in plain terms, liars. **Dr. Snowden** would do better to attempt to answer their arguments. Name-calling is synonymous with mental decadence. Perhaps it is time that *The Banner* looked for a new editor.

PITTSBURGH

Minnesota-Wisconsin Letter

By the Rev. H. Warren Allen

THE spring meeting of the Minneapolis Presbytery was held in the First Presbyterian Church on April 1st. The **Rev. C. C. Adams**, of Maple Plain, preached the retiring Moderator's sermon. The **Rev. Victor B. Nelson**, of Aldrich Avenue Church, Minneapolis, was elected Moderator for the ensuing year. The resignation of the **Rev. H. W. Buck**, of Highland Park Presbyterian Church, Minneapolis, was accepted. The **Rev. P. Hewison Pollock**, of Bryn Mawr Church, Minneapolis, resigned to accept a call to the church at Bozeman, Montana. The **Rev. Paul S. Wright**, of Bethlehem, and the **Rev. Bruce McCullough** of Calvary, both of Minneapolis, have accepted calls to the First Presbyterian Church of Oklahoma City and the Second Presbyterian Church of Moline, Illinois, respectively. The **Rev. Clifford Channer** was received into the Presbyterian Church from the Evangelical Synod and is supplying as stated supply at the church at Howard Lake, Minnesota, being vacant since the death of the pastor, the **Rev. Arthur J. Smith**.

The **Rev. H. Warren Allen** of First Presbyterian Church, Minneapolis, and the **Rev. T. S. Higgins** of Stewart Memorial Church, were elected commissioners to the General Assembly. The **Rev. H. D. Irwin**, of Knox Presbyterian Church, and the **Rev. Robert Olney**, of Oliver, were also elected as the elder commissioners. This is an unusually strong conservative delegation.

The First Presbyterian Church of Minneapolis has plans under way for the celebra-

tion of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the church. **Dr. Clarence Macartney**, of Pittsburgh, will be the anniversary speaker. The Synod will hold its opening meeting in the First Church joining with the church in the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of Presbyterianism in the state of Minnesota. Your correspondent is the pastor of this oldest church in the state.

MINNEAPOLIS

Illinois News Letter

By the Rev. Robert H. Wood

THE **Rev. Dr. William C. Covert**, Moderator of the General Assembly, was the guest on April 27-28 of the First Church of Peoria, the **Rev. Wm. A. Young**, pastor. He spoke to a Men's Rally on Saturday evening and at the morning service of First Church on the 28th. He also spoke from radio station WMBD, Peoria.

Spring meeting of Peoria Presbytery met at the Crow Meadow church, LaRose Hill, Illinois, which church celebrated its ninety-fifth anniversary last fall. The pastor-host, the **Rev. Roger F. Cressey**, was elected Moderator by acclamation. Great interest was manifested in the election of commissioners to the General Assembly. The **Revs. Lindberg** and **Fernandes**, both of Peoria, were elected ministerial delegates, with the **Revs. Logan**, Peoria, and **Hinkle**, Canton, as alternates. Before the election of elder commissioners an attempt, sponsored by the **Rev. Wm. A. Young**, was made to require all elder candidates to state their position relative to the Independent Board. The opposition to this was very strong (led by **Judge Rahn**, an elder of the Pekin church), and it was defeated by a strong majority. **Elders Stevenson** (Crow Meadow church) and **Strawbridge** (Green Valley church) were elected, with **Elder Fuller** (Grace Church, Peoria) as first alternate. The greatest debate, however, came as the result of a request to Presbytery made by the session of Grace Church, Peoria, the **Rev. Albert Lindsey**, pastor. The request, signed by the pastor and all nine elders, was similar to that of Philadelphia North Presbytery in petitioning the 147th General Assembly to rescind the action of last year concerning the members of the Independent Board. The committee on Bills and Overtures voted four to one to refuse the request. The one in favor—**Elder George Storey** (Washington church)—was given an opportunity to defend his position. Then ensued the expected debate which was conducted on a high level, with no personalities injected. Among those speaking in favor of the request were the **Revs. Mr. Lindsey** and **Wood**, both appealing for its adoption on the ground that such action by the Assembly may avert a split in the church. Among those speaking against its adoption were the **Rev. Mr. Hinkle** and **Elder Van-**

denburg (a member of last Assembly's standing committee on Foreign Missions). The **Revs. George Burns** (Eureka) and **W. V. McAdoo** (Peoria Bethel) spoke in favor of no action. Debate was ended by the Moderator because of the late hour, but a vote was demanded by a great majority. The vote was twenty-three to fourteen in favor of accepting the majority report of the committee, hence against adopting the request. Approximately, ten men declined to vote.

The pastoral relation was dissolved, and letters of dismissal granted in the case of two members of Presbytery: The **Rev. E. W. Stimson**, from First Church, Galesburg, to First Church of Sioux City, Iowa; The **Rev. Robert H. Wood**, from First Church, Pekin, to the church at Humboldt, Tennessee.

The special speaker at the evening session of Presbytery was the **Rev. Harold Martin**, Second Church, Bloomington.

On May 10th, **Dr. J. O. Buswell** taught the Friday evening Bible class at Grace Church, Peoria, substituting for **Dr. H. Framer Smith**.

PEKIN, ILLINOIS

The Presbyterian Church in Canada

By T. G. M. Bryan

MR. JOHN BUCHAN, Presbyterian elder, son of the manse, member of parliament, novelist, historian and biographer, has been selected by His Majesty the King, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada, to succeed the Earl of Bessborough as the Governor-General of the Dominion of Canada. He is the first commoner to be chosen for this high office, and the first in fifteen or twenty years who is not a member of the Church of England. **Mr. Buchan** was the King's representative in 1933 and 1934 as Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. He is a graduate of Glasgow and Oxford Universities. Some of his novels such as "Huntingtower" and "Castle Gay" and "John MacNab" deal with Scottish life, and are of particular interest to Presbyterians.

To succeed **Dr. and Mrs. Jonathan Go-forth** in Manchoukuo, the Board of Missions has appointed the **Rev. and Mrs. Edward H. Johnson**, of Long Branch, Ont. **Mr. Johnson's** home church is Melville Church, Westmount, Montreal, and he graduated with high honors from McGill University with a B.Sc. degree. He completed his three years at Princeton Seminary in 1933 and then studied in New College, Edinburgh, and in Berlin. During his student days, **Mr. Johnson** did good work in the Peace River country, a new church being built at Riverside, B. C., during his stay there. **Mrs. E. H. Johnson** comes from Vandergrift, Pa., and is a graduate of Ohio Wesleyan University.

Other new missionaries include Miss Olwen Davies, going to New Amsterdam, British Guiana, as high school principal, and Miss Mildred F. Weir and Miss Ruth L. Heighton to Formosa, Miss Weir being a nurse and Miss Heighton a graduate of the Missionary and Deaconess Training Home.

The following are some of the 172 home mission appointments: Mr. Clifton J. MacKay, B.A., graduate of Knox College, to Portage la Prairie, Man., succeeding the Rev. H. G. Lowry, now of Hull, Que.; Mr. William Weir to Huntsville, Ont.; Mr. James S. Clarke to Banks, Ont.; Mr. Samuel Johnston, B.A., to Rockwood and St. Paul's, Guelph; Mr. George W. Murdoch to Vancouver, Ont.; Mr. Robert A. Sinclair to Mar, Ont.; Mr. Kenneth M. Glazier to Estevan, Sask.; and Mr. James Milroy to Niagara Falls North.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Irish Letter

By S. W. Murray

VARIOUS Synods of the Irish Presbyterian Church, held their stated meetings on March 19.

In the Belfast Synod, the report on the State of Religion indicated that a more zealous attention was being given to the call of worship. Many Kirk Sessions reported much larger attendances at Holy Communion, but the number of communicants did not bear a just proportion to the number of families. There was abundant evidence that their people in the main led a life of complete sobriety.

The Rev. J. H. R. Gibson, M.A., the outgoing Moderator of the Synod of Derry and Omagh, said they had to admit that organized Christianity had largely failed because they had not laid sufficient emphasis on the church's message. They should be moved to despair by church officials who will fill pews at any cost. In that lay the heresy of confusing Christianity with Churchianity. The Church was carrying too many passengers which hindered rather than helped her progress. If 10% of our members were Christians in fact as well as by profession, Ireland would speedily become in reality what it is now in name—"a land of saints and scholars."

The Rev. James McCammon, M.A., of the Irish Presbyterian Mission, Newchwang, Manchukuo, reported that the baptized membership of his district had increased from 1,200 to 2,800 in five years. This is due in the main to intensive evangelistic work, much of which is maintained by the Chinese Church itself.

A recent development has been the establishment of the Newchwang Bible School, an institution which is controlled and supported in the main by the Chinese themselves. Commodious premises have been built through a private gift and the enrollment is 130 full time students. Evangelistic bands

from the Bible School are being largely used in evangelistic and revival work throughout Manchukuo. Among those supporting the Bible School is the veteran Dr. Jonathan Goforth, of the Canadian Presbyterian Mission. This institution is thoroughly evangelical and is supported by missionaries representing different missions as well as the Chinese Church.

The Rev. Andrew Prentice, of St. Enoch's Church, Belfast, has accepted a call to Trinity Presbyterian Church, Claughton, Brikenhead, and the Rev. J. W. Johnston, M.A., of Buckna, Ballymena, a call to Townsend Presbyterian Church, Belfast.

The death is announced of the Rev. Dr. John S. Aston, Senior Jewish Missionary under the Irish Presbyterian Church, at Hamburg.

BELFAST

Letter from Melbourne,

Australia

By the Rev. H. T. Rush (Secretary Bible Union of Victoria)

THE Bible Union of West Australia held its Annual meetings some little while since. The report says they were held in the McNess Hall, Perth, and were very successful. The Rev. C. Urquhart, B.A., was chairman of the afternoon session, when valuable addresses were given by the Rev. T. P. McEvoy on "the Bible the only Infallible Rule of Faith and Practice" and the Rev. Hugh Paton on the "Words that Jesus got and gave." Pastor Raymond, secretary of the Union, presided in the evening, when Mr. W. J. Beasley, of Melbourne, with the aid of moving and still pictures, lectured on Ancient Jericho. The President, the Rev. Geo. Tulloch, has recently returned from a visit to the old land.

Melbourne is just getting over the stir of its Centenary gatherings—a season of splendid illuminations, decorations, festivities, pageantry; a royal welcome to the Duke of Gloucester as representative of the King, the unveiling of a great memorial shrine, overseas flying and numerous athletic contests; and right in the midst of it all one of the most disastrous floods that the city and country has ever known. On the religious side were numerous great functions—a big Anglican congress, a march of 15,000 Protestant Sunday School children, and Roman Catholic Eucharistic gatherings staged with great pomp and ceremonial, etc., etc. In the erection of fine buildings, material progress, in ecclesiastical parade and display Rome is making a great bid for pre-eminence. Rome, too, stands for the Bible as the Word of God, even if it must be interpreted in line with her traditions and dogmas. She claims authority. Protestantism puts forth an open Bible, but it is a Bible in tatters and largely denuded of authority. In place of the Bible she puts

forth the authority of a Jesus discredited through His Word or a heterogeneous religious experience which has no common denominator. When will Protestantism get back to the true source of her strength?

The death of Mr. E. Lee Neil, C.B.E., has removed a prominent citizen, commercial leader, financier, and above all a great figure in the evangelical religious life of Melbourne. He won his way to a foremost position by sterling Christian character, fine ability and many sided service. In the Cathedral a large gathering listened to an impressive address by the Rev. C. H. Nash, M.A., who speaking from a close friendship of over 30 years paid a very fine tribute to his loyal stewardship.

To launch an evangelistic campaign in the midst of the world and pleasure engrossment of Centenary celebrations might seem to be courting failure. A committee of twenty-two workers, with unceasing prayer to God, won through. The meetings by the Rev. W. P. Nicholson increased in interest, much of the work of the Holy Spirit was manifest, many souls were won, and many Christians sought fullness of blessing.

MELBOURNE

Ethiopian News!

By the Rev. James L. Rohrbaugh

THE biggest news of Missionary interest is the Italian-Ethiopian war scare. Everyone here expects Italy to eventually take the country and considers the recent Ualual clash to be the opening encounter. When the Italians took Eritrea they told the missionaries to stay as long as they wished, but once they departed they were forbidden to return. Some stayed thirty years. The natives' attitude on the question is typical: "We beat them once before (1892) and we have more guns now than we had then, so we are certain to beat them this time."

Dr. T. A. Lambie, Field Director of the Sudan Interior Mission, has voluntarily renounced his American citizenship and become an Ethiopian subject. The continual suspicion of the authorities and their reluctance to grant permission for new stations prompted him to take this step as an evidence of his sincerity. Whether one approves or disapproves, one must admire the consecration which impels a man to renounce the land of his birth for the sake of the work of the Lord he loves.

The Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society, an independent board working within the State Church of England, has come in force to Ethiopia. They have opened three new stations and plan to open two more within the next month. Alfred Buxton has come out to be Field Director.

Gresham Speedy, an independent worker from the Honor Oak group in England, has rented a large hotel and automobile

exposition building in Addis Ababa and plans to open a Y. M. C. A. modelled after Captain Wallis' work in Dublin. He is expecting a group of workers to come out to help him.

Three young American ladies of the Pentecostal persuasion, under Miss Domer-muth, have opened a school for the large Armenian population here. Their school is thriving and they, too, are expecting reinforcements, soon.

Five new workers came to the S. I. M. in December and another group is expected shortly, so it is evident that in a Missionary way things are booming. Clarence Duff is just completing the translation of the Gospel of Matthew into the Gudeila language. It will be the first writing of any sort in that tongue.

The writer wishes to report that in his first year here in Ethiopia he has gained a fair knowledge of the language, a wife and with her has opened meetings in a number of different places in Addis Ababa. The attendance last Sunday was nearly 300. The next personal report will be a year from now, at which time, we hope to be able to report not less than one thousand. The need is great, the workers—in spite of new additions—are incredibly few. Pray the Lord of the harvest that He may send forth more workers and that He may bless the seed that is sown.

ADDIS ABABA.

Japan Letter

By the Rev. L. W. Moore

National Christian Council

AN EFFORT is being made to form a church federation within the framework of the National Christian Council which would handle matters concerning only the indigenous church.

The Church of Christ in Japan (Pres.) presented a plan which would replace the present National Christian Council with a Japanese Church Council, entirely church-centric. Other Christian organizations would be related in an associate capacity. Delegates from the churches would be full members with the right to vote; other delegates would be allowed the privileges of the floor.

This is according to the genius of the Church of Christ in Japan, for from the organization of its first church until today it has handled all its own affairs with missions related in a more or less close associate capacity.

The Congregational members of the Council incline to the perfection of the present organization without radical change. The Methodist prefer the continuation of

ACTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1837

"We believe that our powers, as a judicatory, are limited and prescribed by the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. Whatever any judicatory may do which it is not authorized by the Constitution to do, is not binding on any inferior judicatory, nor on any subsequent Assembly. . . . The fact that they have been recognized by former Assemblies cannot bind this Assembly. . . ." (Part of the Answer of the Assembly of 1837 to a protest against the action of that Assembly in abrogating the "Plan of Union" entered into by the Assembly of 1801. Minutes 1835-1838, page 450.)

the present broad united front representing the majority of Christendom in Japan.

Union

The Committee on Union of the National Christian Council reports little more than progress. In a recent meeting of the Committee, Mr. Yoshimine Abe (Meth.) expressed the opinion that the time for arguing about union had passed. It was time now to consummate the union. Mr. Suehiro Noguchi (Cong.) seemed to think that the only problem left was how to accomplish the union in the most efficient way. Mr. W. M. Vories, of the Omi Brotherhood, has advanced the novel ideal of submitting the question of union to the laity, since all the objections were raised by the ministers. Since Mr. Vories is an architect, someone suggested that it would be as reasonable to leave all building planning to those who were not specialists.

The Committee is faced with five major problems:

1. Name. The name proposed is The United Church of Christ in Japan.

2. Articles of Faith. It is proposed to

make the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed the creed of the United Church.

3. The Bible. "We hold the Bible as containing the essence of salvation, the principles for the life of faith."

4. Sacraments. There seems to be the perennial problem of immersion or sprinkling in baptism, and memorial or miracle in the communion.

5. Government. Representative government is favored by the committee, but it is difficult to persuade the Episcopalians to give up their bishops.

The real difficulty, however, is of the doctrinal nature and goes pretty deep. At the meeting of the Synod of the Church of Christ in Japan and of the Convention of the Congregational Church, in Kyoto in 1933, Mrs. Tamaki Uemura, daughter of the late Dr. Uemura, and pastor of the Shiragi Church (Pres.), Tokyo, told the Congregationalists very plainly and publicly that the real issue was how we regarded the life, death, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. It was a clear statement of the issue before the church as it is in the minds of many members of the Church of Christ in Japan. The present writer would venture the opinion that from now on the history of the church in Japan will register more divisions than unions, unless the government gathers courage to take the church over entirely. Then you may look for persecution.

Episcopal Prayer Book

After passing through thirty-two editions from 1895 to the present, someone has found that the Episcopal Prayer Book contains the words "God save our Emperor" in the Japanese edition, corresponding to "God save our King" in the English edition. The papers have made quite a bit of news about it, stating that it is disrespectful to the Emperor to speak of His Majesty as needing salvation. Saner minds feel that it is but another form of nationalistic propaganda. According to the chairman of the Prayer Book Committee, the church is ready to change the wording, if necessary.

The Church of Christ

According to its 1934 reports, the Church of Christ in Japan had at the end of 1933, 49,717 communicants and 4,289 noncommunicants, making a total of 54,006 members, an increase of 1,517 over the previous year. They have 252 ordained ministers and 219 licentiates, a total of 501. (This does not include the fifty-nine ordained missionaries of the four missions connected with the church.) An average of about one minister to 100 members. The resident membership is 22,572, which gives an average of one minister or licentiate for forty-five resident members. The gifts for 1933 were 510,826 yen or an average of 23 yen per resident member. The offerings were 160,000 yen less than the previous year.

TOYOHASHI, JAPAN

IN THIS ISSUE:

Which Is the Rule of Faith and Life: The Word of God or the Voice of the Church?	4
William Childs Robinson	
Unscientific "Rethinking"	7
L. Nelson Bell	
A Testimony of Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.	10
Dr. Rimmer and the Flemington Meetings: The Story Behind the Story	12
Charles E. Wideman	
Letters to the Editor	13
Sunday School Lessons	15
News of the Church	18
Independent Board Meets, Seven Missionaries Appointed	19